

A  
VINDICATION  
OF THE  
Church of *England*,

From the Errors and Corruptions of  
the CHURCH of *ROME*.

WHEREIN

As is largely proved, the Rule of FAITH,  
and all the Fundamental Articles of the CHRI-  
STIAN RELIGION, are received, taught, pro-  
fessed, and acknowledged.

BY

Dr. GEORGE BULL,  
Late Lord Bishop of St. DAVID's.

Written at the Request of the

COUNTESS of NEWBRUGH,  
IN

ANSWER to a celebrated Roman Catholick  
Treatise intituled, *The Catholick Scripturist*.

---

*Published from his LORDSHIP's Manuscript,*  
*by his Son ROBERT BULL, Rector*  
*of Tortworth, and Prebendary of Gloucester.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for E. CURLL in *Fleetstreet*. MDCCXIX.

WINDICATION

OF THE

Church of England

the Church of England

THE

As a special privilege of the Church of England



DR. GEORGE B. BULLOCK

of the Church of England

of the Church of England

of the Church of England

of the Church of England

of the Church of England





T H E  
P R E F A C E.



Sometime in last *December*, I received a Letter from Mr. CURLL the Bookseller, acquainting me that a *Manuscript* of my Father's, Intituled, *A Letter to the Countess of NEWBRUGH*, was found among the Papers of a Gentleman lately deceased. The *Manuscript* hath since been transmitted to me, and I have carefully perused it. And tho' I was at first surpris'd

## PREFACE.

to find it not written in my Father's own Hand, yet, upon farther Recollection, I see no manner of Reason to question but that the Treatise is His; having frequently heard him mention such a Letter, and seen several of his Papers, (written, as near as I can guess, about the same Time) transcribed by the same Hand. From whence I farther conclude, that the *Manuscript* of which I am now speaking, is the very same that was sent to the Countess of *Newbrugh*, and which Mr. *Nelson* so laments the Loss of, P. 79. of his Life of my Father. For the Sake of those Readers who may not have seen that excellent Piece of Mr. *Nelson's*, I shall here insert the whole Paragraph.

‘ While Mr. *Bull* was Rector of  
‘ *Suddington*, the Providence of God  
‘ gave him an Opportunity of fix-  
‘ ing two Ladies of Quality, in  
‘ that

## PREFACE.

‘ that Neighbourhood, in the Pro-  
‘ testant Communion ; who had  
‘ been reduced to a very wavering  
‘ State of Mind, by the Arts and  
‘ Subtilties of some *Romish* Missio-  
‘ naries. Their specious Pretences  
‘ to Antiquity were easily detected  
‘ by this great Master of the An-  
‘ cient Fathers ; and by his tho-  
‘ rough Acquaintance with Scrip-  
‘ ture, and the Sense of the Catho-  
‘ lick Church in Matters of the  
‘ greatest Importance, he was able  
‘ to distinguish between Primitive  
‘ Truths, and those Errors which  
‘ the Church of *Rome* built upon  
‘ them. He had frequent Confe-  
‘ rences with both these Ladies,  
‘ and answered those Objections  
‘ which appeared to them to have  
‘ the greatest Strength, and by  
‘ which they were very near falling  
‘ from their Stedfastness : For one  
‘ of them he writ a small Treatise,

## PREFACE.

‘ which she had requested from him,  
‘ but no Copy of it is to be found  
‘ among those Papers he left behind  
‘ him ; nothing remaineth of it but  
‘ the Remembrance that it was writ-  
‘ ten, and that he did thereby succeed  
‘ in establishing the Lady in the Com-  
‘ munion of the Church of England.  
‘ Both the Ladies always owned,  
‘ with the greatest Sense of Grati-  
‘ tude, this signal Service they re-  
‘ ceived from the Learning and  
‘ Capacity of Mr. Bull. None can  
‘ well apprehend how grievous a  
‘ State of Human Life Doubt is, in  
‘ Matters of Consequence, but  
‘ they who feel it ; and therefore,  
‘ no Wonder if they blest that hap-  
‘ py Instrument, by which fresh  
‘ Light was conveyed into their  
‘ Minds, and those Uncertainties  
‘ cleared up, which they laboured  
‘ under, in Reference to Matters of  
‘ the greatest Moment. The Method,  
‘ indeed,



## P R E F A C E.

‘ indeed, they took, was Prudent and  
‘ Christian, to seek for Knowledge  
‘ at those Lips which are appointed  
‘ to preserve it, and to bring their  
‘ Doubts to their own Pastors, be-  
‘ fore they submit to the Authori-  
‘ ty of others. And I question  
‘ not but for this Reason, among  
‘ many, God thought fit to give  
‘ them the Satisfaction they sought  
‘ for ; and if others, who are  
‘ assaulted after this Manner, would  
‘ take the same Course, I doubt  
‘ not, but that they would find  
‘ the same Success.

If the Reader is desirous to know  
who those Ladies (mentioned in  
the Beginning of the Paragraph)  
were, I can only tell him, that one  
of them was the Wife of a worthy  
Person now living, who (for Rea-  
sons best known to himself) was  
unwilling her Name should be men-  
tioned upon such an Occasion by  
Mr.

## PREFACE.

Mr. *Nelson* ; and supposing him to be still of the same Opinion, I shall not insert any thing here which may be grating to him. The other was the Countess of NEWBRUGH, for whose Sake this Treatise was composed. And of Her all the Account I can at present give, is, that she was Daughter and sole Heiress to Sir *Henry Pool*, Bart. of *Salperton* in the County of *Gloucester*, and Wife to *Charles Leviston*, who, for Services done the Crown in the Reign of King *Charles* the 2d, was by him created Earl of *Newbrugh* in the Kingdom of *Scotland*, and held a considerable Place in that King's Favour as long as he lived. She was a Lady (as I have been informed by Persons who very well remember her) of great Personal Endowments ; and the Reader may collect the same from several Passages in the following Letter.

## PREFACE.

Letter. It seems to have been her Mother, the Lady \* *Pool of Cyrencester*, who first advised her to consult my Father in this important Affair; who, out of a Sense of Gratitude for this and other Services done her Family, and to testify the great Esteem she had for him, did afterwards, in her last Will, appoint him to be her Executor. †

As to the Letter itself, I shall forbear giving any Character of it, my near Relation to the Author, unqualifying me for such an Undertaking. The Reader himself must judge of that, who (I question not) upon a full Perusal of it, will esteem it a Performance worthy the Author, whose Name it bears. I will no longer deprive  
the

---

\* See, *Marg. Reference, of this Treatise*, P. 5.

† See, *The Life of Bishop Bull*, P. 48.

# PREFACE.

the Reader of the Satisfaction the following Treatise may afford him, than to let him know he is obliged to that worthy Gentleman, Mr. *Richard Rawlinson*, A. M. of *St. John's College, Oxon.* and F. R. S. for the Discovery of this *Manuscript*, who, for rescuing it from the Obscurity it had lain in for almost Fifty Years, and bestowing it on the Publick, by me, has a just Right to the Thanks of every one who shall receive Advantage from it.

*Tortworth,*  
*April 18, 1719.*

ROBERT BULL.



IMAGI

THE





THE  
CONTENTS.

<b>I</b> NTRODUCTION	Page 1
Of Corporal Austerities	5
<i>A Reply to a Book intituled, The Catholick Scripturist; (or, the Plea of the Roman Catholicks: Shew- ing the Scriptures to hold the Roman Faith in above Forty of the chief Con- troversies now under Debate. By Jo- seph Mumford, Priest, of the Society of Jesus)</i>	14

b

— Of

# The CONTENTS.

—Of Tradition	21
—Of the Invocation of Saints	23
—Of the Half Communion, or receiving the Sacrament only in One Kind	89
—Of the Infallibility of the Roman Church	108, 220
—Of Transubstantiation, &c.	111, 158
—Of Image-Worship	121
—Of the True Church	128
—Of the Succession of Pastors in our Church	159
—The Case fairly stated	164, 228
—Of the Liturgy of the Church of England	168
—Of the Reformation, and 39 Articles	177, 178, 217
—Of the fundamental Principles of the Christian Religion and of the Rule of Faith	184
—Of the TRINITY	188
—Of the Ancient Doxologies	195
—Of the Prevarication of the Trent Fathers concerning the Rule of Faith, &c.	202, 230

II MAGI

—The

# The CONTENTS.

—The Church of England cleared from Prevarication	216
—Of the Decrees of the Council of Trent	229
—first Council of Nice	232
The CONCLUSION	234

---

## ERRATA.

Page 4 Line ult. read having; p. 6 l. ult. r. ἰθὺλο; p. 8 l. 3 instead of practised, r. commonly practised; p. 23 l. 16 r. Consequence; p. 30 l. 13 dele have; p. 35 l. 1 r. ingenuous, l. 14 r. poterant; p. 39 l. 4 r. wherefore; p. 42 l. 8 r. inshrine; p. 50 l. 1 dele I, l. 9 r. petitory; p. 52 l. ult. for Lev. r. Loc.; p. 59 l. 7 for to r. so, l. 12 r. worshipping; p. 60 l. 15 after Souls add and that; p. 61 l. 3 r. know, l. ult. r. ἀμὴ; p. 68 l. 9 r. the Truth; p. 86 l. 1 r. those; p. 87 l. 2 r. or Oral, l. 14 r. ingenuous; p. 100 l. 7 r. Halensis; p. 110 l. 6 for possible r. infallible, l. 12 for Art. 1 r. Acts 1; p. 113 l. 4 r. Reason; p. 115 l. 13 r. arrogateh; p. 122 l. 7 dele nor, l. ult. r. dæ; p. 140 l. 13 dele and; p. 158 l. 10 r. call themselves the only true; p. 193 l. 9 r. such as is; p. 206 l. 5 dele and; p. 234 l. 8. r. and wittingly; p. 236 l. 17 r. Infidelity; p. 238 l. 12 dele both.

SECRET

THE LOCAL UNION

11 MA 61

11 MA 61








A  
LETTER

To the Right Honourable the  
Countess of NEWBRUGH.

MADAM,

§ 1.  Humbly beg your  
Ladyship's Pardon,  
that I have not  
sooner performed my Duty, and  
obeyed your Ladyship's Desires,  
(which with me ought to have the

B

Force

Force of Commands) by returning an Answer to the Letter of your *Roman* Catholick Friend and Relation. The Truth is; the Letter came from your Ladyship to my Hands (after a considerable Stop) in a very ill Season, when I was wholly taken up by other Businesses not to be dispensed with; and I do not remember, that in all my Life I have had a Task imposed on me in so unhappy a Conjunction of Circumstances: Yet some Hours I have forcibly snatched from the Importunity of those urgent Occasions, in which I have made a Shift to shape the following Answer. In reading whereof,

all

all the Favour I shall desire from your Ladyship is this. First, That you would trust me in those Citations out of the Fathers and learned Authors, which I produce, 'till the Author of the Letter shall prove me guilty of Prevarication therein, which I am sure he will never be able to do. Secondly, That your Ladyship would excuse that Sharpness of Stile, which I sometime make Use of in my Answer. Indeed, the Honourable Relation to your Ladyship, which the Author of the Letter lays Claim to, hath restrained me from handling him as he deserves: But my Zeal to the Honour of God and his Holy

Truth, so grossly confronted by him,  
 (which, I perswade my self, is  
 dearer also to your Ladyship than  
 your own Honour) hath constrained  
 me sometimes to give him a just  
 Rebuke. Having premised these  
 my humble Requests unto your  
 Ladyship, I shall proceed (without  
 the Complement of any farther  
 Preface) to examine whatsoever may  
 seem any Way considerable in the  
 Letter:

§ 2. That Collection of Texts  
 of Scripture concerning Corporal  
 Austerities, which the Author of  
 the Letter mentions, what it is I  
 know not, your Ladyship it seems  
 therefore  
 having



having forgotten to send it; \* and therefore cannot give him a direct Answer to this Part of his Letter. But, in general, I can give your Ladyship St. Paul's Determination of the Question: *1 Tim. iv. 8. Bodily Exercise profiteth little; but Godliness is profitable for all Things, &c.* In the former Part of which Sentence the Apostle acknowledgeth some little Use of *Bodily Exercise*, or *Corporal Austerities*, or *Restraints* and *Castigations* laid upon the Body. These may be, in some Degree useful, at least to some Persons;

---

\* I have since receiv'd it from the Lady P. and find it so inconsiderable, as not to deserve any more particular Answer than is here given to it.

† ἐν ἐθελουσιᾷ.

\* Οὐ Νότιον Δόξαν ἔκαστα νομίας.  
† ἐν ἐλευθεροσκέα.

*fairly and freely, not by Impositi-*  
*on from others, not as necessary Acts*  
*of Piety. Secondly, That they be*  
*used with Humility, not Priding*  
*ourselves in them as great Archieve-*  
*ments in Religion; not supercil-*  
*iously Condemning or Despising o-*  
*thers, who allow themselves a*  
*greater (if lawful) Freedom than*  
*we do. Thirdly, That they be really*  
*made Use of, for the Castigation of*  
*the Body, and not in Hypocritical*  
*Pretence, so as that in the mean*  
*Time we indulge ourselves in as great*  
*Delights, or greater than those from*  
*which we abstain. I beseech your*  
*Ladyship to consider these Three*  
*Cautions of the Apostle; and then*

I shall leave it to your self to judge, how far the Austerities <sup>commonly</sup> practised in the Church of Rome, are from being conform to those Golden Rules. For I am not willing to take the Occasion that is here given me, of Laughing at the Follies of our Adversaries in this Particular. Corporal Austerities thus limited, the True Sons of the Church of *England*, most willingly admit of and embrace; and I speak from my Conscience, that I think those Austerities are, in *Silence*, better practised by some of our Church, than by the Generality of the *Romanists* that so much glory in them. But it is the latter

Part



Part of the Apostle's Determination, that we mainly stick to. *Godliness is profitable for all Things* ; that is, true Piety, consisting in the Love of God, and our Neighbours as our selves, together with the Fruits and Effects of these, is always, and to all Persons, useful : Indeed this is the *unum necessarium*, that one necessary Thing.

§ 3. To this Tryal we will stand ; let that Church that most earnestly presseth this real Piety, carry the Bell, and be acknowledged for the best Church ; and if this Commendation be found due to the Church of *Rome*, in its present Estate, I will never speak a Word

C

to

to dissuade your Ladyship from leaving our Communion, and casting your self into the Bosom of that Church, which is displayed at this Day with so alluring a Bravery; but will engage my self to attend your Ladyship in a Voyage to *Rome*, in the Quality of one of your Lacqueys. The Truth is, this very Consideration kept me, when I was yet unacquainted with the true State of the Controversy between us and the *Roman* Church, from having any Affection to the same, although I have not wanted some considerable Temptations to entertain better Thoughts thereof; for ever since I understood any  
 Thing

Thing of Religion, I have apprehended the certain Truth of what St. Paul tells us, Rom. 14. 17. *That the Kingdom of God doth not consist in Meat and Drink, and such like external Things, but in Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost ; that the Soul of Piety lies in the Piety of the Soul ; and then observing how the Spirits of the Roman Devotion spend themselves in outward and external Things, leaving the Heart and vital Parts thereof cold and languishing : How like the Pharisees they shew themselves mighty Zealots in the little Appendages of Religion, whilst they neglect the weightier Mat-*

*ters of the Law* : How amongst  
 them 'tis accounted almost (if not  
 altogether) as heinous a Crime to  
 break a frivolous Institution of one  
 of their vainly devised Orders, as  
 to transgress a direct Command  
 of God : How that Faction among  
 them that governs the Church of  
*Rome*, (the *Jesuits*) are of all Mor-  
 tals the easiest and loosest Casuists,  
 in Questions that concern the Sub-  
 stance of Religion : How the Corpo-  
 ral Austerities, (they so much boast  
 of) and commonly used by them  
 are Commutations for the great  
 and indispensable Duties of Christi-  
 anity, and Umbrages to the foul-  
 est Vices and Impurities : (Whence  
 it



it comes to pass, that the most carnal and sensual Protestants are most easily induced to undertake them; and it is to be observed by every one, now a-Days, that the Filth of our Church doth empty itself into the Sink of *Rome*.) I say, when I considered these Things, I was so far from admiring the Church of *Rome* for that Face of Religious Severity, which it hath affected to put on, that that very Affectation made me out of Love with it, yea, wrought in me a Kind of loathing of it: But enough of the Corporal Austerities of the Church of *Rome*.

§ 4. In the next Place, supposing that the Collection of Texts of Scripture

ture mentioned, had opened to your Ladyship a Prospect into farther Doubts, that is, had puzzled your Ladyship, and unfetled you, and so made Way for his farther Attempts upon your Conscience and Religion; he proceeded to recommend to your Ladyship the Perusal of a Book, call'd *The Catholick Scripturist*, † and promiseth that therein you shall find not only the Faith, but the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, in Matters of Religion, manifestly confirmed by the holy Scriptures. I am sorry I have not the Book by me, as your Ladyship supposeth; for

---

† I wonder he should promise himself such great Matters from so sorry a Scrip of Paper.

for the Book you were pleased to  
 lend me upon taking my Leave of  
 your Ladyship, when last at *Lon-*  
*don*, after a cursory Perusal of it,  
 I left with a Friend of mine to  
 be speedily returned to your Lady-  
 ship, with my humble Thanks; and  
 by what Accident it hath been in-  
 tercepted I cannot understand. By  
 what I remember of the Contents  
 of the Book, I may venture to say,  
 it is an errant Piece of Sophistry,  
 like those that used to be scattered  
 among us by the Ministers of the  
 Church of *Rome*. Indeed, if I  
 had the Book by me, it would be  
 too long a Work for a Letter to an-  
 swer the several Chapters thereof;  
 but

but otherwise the Task would be easy, I desire none more facile.

§ 5. However, by its Title Page (if I could remember no more) I were able to refute it : *The Catho<sup>l</sup>ick Scripturist*. What, doth he mean the *Roman* Catholick Scripturist ? Yes, doubtless ; but then your Ladyship may presently discern in the very Title a Contradiction in Terms : You may easily see, that the very Design of that Book is contrary to the professed Design and Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* : To make this plain, I desire your Ladyship to ask the Author of the Letter these few Questions, 1. Are all the Points defended in the  
Book



Book, called *the Catholick Scripturist*, clearly proved by the holy Scriptures.

2. Is the Belief of these Points, (which are all principal Ones in Controversy betwixt us and the Church of *Rome*) together with the Belief of the other Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, equally acknowledged by us and them to be delivered in the holy Scriptures, a Belief sufficient unto Salvation?

3. Doth not the Church of *Rome* professedly maintain, that all Things necessary to be known and believed unto Salvation, are neither in express Terms, or by necessary Con-

D

sequence,

sequence, delivered and contained in the holy Scriptures, and that there is Need of the Tradition of the Church, as a Supply in this Case? He cannot (for Shame) but answer affirmatively to each of these Questions. For as for the first Question, 'tis the professed Design of that Book to maintain, that all the Points undertaken to be defended therein, may be proved out of the holy Scriptures; and the Author of the Letter adds manifestly, and he afterwards tells your Ladyship, that he doubts not but that the Result of his Letter to you, and the Book attending it,

will

will end in this Admiration : \* *Who would have thought it, that the Papists could have so much to say for themselves out of most clear Texts of the Word of God ?* Indeed, I never so much as dreamed that the Papists could, out of the holy Scriptures, produce any Thing to the Purpose in Defence of their Tenets concerning *Image - Worship, Invocation of Saints, Transubstantiation, the Half-Communion, Indulgencies, &c.* Nor

D 2

hath

---

\* *And the Catholick Scripturist tells us, that he would produce for the Points most disliked in his Religion, many and loud speaking Texts. Pref. n. 4.*

hath the Book in the least altered my Thoughts and Apprehensions.

II. That the Points defended in the Book, (called *the Catholick Scripturist*) together with those other Points that are on both Sides acknowledged to be clearly delivered in the holy Scriptures, do make up a full and compleat Body of Catholick Principles, or the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith, he must acknowledge; otherwise, what Bounds will he put to the necessary Articles of Religion? How shall a sincere Christian know when he believes and practiseth that which is sufficient in Order to his Salvation? And, besides, what other  
Point



Point of the *Roman* Faith can he produce more difficult to be proved out of the holy Scriptures, than those, whose Defence is undertaken by the Author of the *Catholick Scripturist*? From these two Propositions granted, it undeniably follows, that all necessary Points of *Christian Doctrine* may be proved out of the holy Scriptures, and that by most clear and manifest Texts; which is directly contrary to the known and avowed Doctrine of the Papists themselves: Nay, the *Catholick Scripturist* hath a Chapter (if I forget not) concerning *Tradition*; the professed Design whereof is to prove, that we must be beholding  
to

to *Tradition* for many necessary Points of Faith, and that the Scripture is not a sufficient Rule. I confess I am amazed, when I observe with what a *fatal Stupidity*, or rather with what an *evil Conscience*, and how *fraudulently* the *Romanists* defend their Cause; but indeed a Cause so bad could no otherwise be defended.

§. 6. Many particular Instances of the Sophistry of that Book I might give your Ladyship, if I had it by me; but there is one Instance I took special Notice of, and wrote my Observations in a Scrip of Paper; because it was a Point wherein your Ladyship seemed to need

Satisf-

Satisfaction, viz. the Point of *In-  
 vocation of Saints*. He undertakes  
 not to prove the Laudableness of  
 that Practice of his Church by *ex-  
 press Scriptures*, but by *necessary Con-  
 sequences*, from certain Principles  
 clearly delivered in Scripture. The  
 Principles he lays down, *Point 36,*  
*n. 2, pag. 235.* 1. *That the An-  
 gels and Saints, with God, can hear*  
*our Prayers.* 2. *That they can and*  
*will help us.* From these Principles  
 he draws this Conclusion: *Therefore*  
*it is laudable to pray to them.* I will  
 not quarrel (at present) with the  
 Consequences; but enquire only  
 how he proves the Antecedent.  
 Many, yea, most of the principal  
 Texts,

Texts, whereby he endeavours to  
 demonstrate his two Principles, are  
 taken out of the *Old Testament*.  
 When he comes to his 37th Point,  
 (which is the first of his Principles)  
*That the Angels and Saints can hear*  
*our Prayers*, he proves it especially  
 by Texts that are either taken out  
 of, or at least have Reference to, the  
*Old Testament*. Thus, (*Num. 4.*)  
 from *Luke 16* and *26*, he observes,  
 (like a learned Divine arguing from  
 such Passages in a Parable, which  
 do not in the least belong to the  
 Scope thereof) that, *tho' there be a*  
*great Gulf fixed between the Souls of*  
*Abraham and Dives*, yet God gave  
 them some Means to hear what each  
 of



of them said ; from whence he makes his Inference by Way of Question : *Can he then find no Means for Saints to hear us?* This Text is, indeed, taken out of the *New Testament*, but it hath a manifest Reference to the State of *Abraham* ; and the Saints departed under the *Old Testament*. But, Num. 5, he professedly produceth one Text out of the *Old Testament*, which he tells us, he had kept as a Reserve, to declare how Saints, even there, knew what passed. It concerns the Writing that came from *Elias* after his Death (as is supposed) to King *Zoram*, 2 *Chron.* 21. 12. In the 38th Point, he delivers his second Principle,

E ciple,

ciple, together with the Conclusion drawn from both, in these Words : *That Saints can and will help us ; therefore 'tis laudable to pray to them.* How proves he this ? (Num. 4.) *That by the Merits of Saints we may beg and obtain Favours.* He proves, from 1 Kings 15. 45. and Isa. 37. 16, 35. And (Num. 5.) he tells us, that *the Power which the Prayers of Saints have, and that they use carefully to prove for us, is often expressed in Scripture ;* where he cites Jerem. 15. and 1 Ezek. 14. and 14. 20. And the Instance of *Elias* his Care to assist his People after his Death, mentioned in the former Point,

Num.

*Num.* 5, and the famous Vision of *Judas Machabew*, 2. *Mach.* 15 and 12. All these Texts are again out of the *Old Testament* : And he proceeds (*Num.* 5.) to prove the same Thing from *Dives* his praying to *Abraham*, *Luke* 16: 27. Which Texts I have already observed to have Reference to the Saints departed under the *Old Testament*.

§. 7. Now, after this laborious Proof out of the *Old Testament* of both the Foundations of Invocation of Saints, viz. That the Saints can hear our Prayers. 2. That they can and will help us. Who would not conclude according to the Author's own Way of Reasoning :

That 'twas a laudable Practice to pray to Saints even under the *Old Testament*? But the *Catholick Scripturist* himself will by no Means own this Conclusion. For in the 38th Point, *Num. 1, Pag. 253*, he expressly tells us, that *of praying to Saints the Old Testament could not write, no Saints being as then in Heaven.* For the understanding of which, your Ladyship may please to observe, that these *two Hypotheses* are generally received among the Papists. 1. That the Saints, departed this Life since the Ascension of our Saviour, are in the Third Heaven, and do enjoy the *Beatifick Vision*; and that in the

Glas



Glas of the Holy Trinity, or some other Way, they do see or understand the particular Necessities of Men on Earth ; and therefore may rationally be invocated and prayed unto. So the Author of the *Catholic Scripturist*, Point 36, Num. 1, being to enter upon his head Province, of proving the Invocation of Saints and Angels out of Scripture, lays down this as his Foundation, in these express Words, for the Ground of this Question : *I lay this Foundation out of Scripture, that as the Angels are in Heaven, so the Souls of the Saints go directly from hence to Heaven, without they have some few Offences to clear in Purgatory.*

10ry. 2. That the Souls of the  
 Faithful, that dyed before our Savi-  
 our, went not to Heaven, enjoyed  
 not the *Beatifick Vision*, nay, were  
 not so much as in *Paradise* ; but  
 contrarily were in a State of Con-  
 finement, and shut up in a sorry  
 Place, which they call *Limbus Pa-*  
*trum* ; and that our Saviour, after  
 his Death, descended to that Place,  
 to fetch and deliver them from  
 thence ; and consequently that it  
 would ~~have~~ have been an absurd  
 Thing for Men, under the *Old*  
*Testament*, to pray to Saints de-  
 parted for Help, that were in a  
 Condition wherein they needed  
 Help themselves. And yet the  
 Author

Author of the *Catholick Scripturist*,  
 who acknowledgeth both these  
 Doctrines of his Church, hath the  
 Impudence to attempt the Proof  
 out of the *Old Testament* of both  
 his Principles, whereon he grounds  
 Invocation of Saints, viz. That the  
 Saints can hear our Prayers, and  
 that they can and will help us;  
 and, consequently, that it is lauda-  
 ble to pray unto them. And 'tis  
 pretty to observe again, how di-  
 rectly he contradicts himself in this  
 Question: We have already heard  
 him acknowledge there could be  
 no such Thing as praying to Saints,  
 delivered in the *Old Testament*.  
 Why? Because the Saints then were  
 not

not in Heaven. If there could be no such Thing taught, there could be no such Thing laudably practised, under the *Old Testament*; and yet that Invocation of Saints was practised, and that laudably too, under the *Old Testament*, he other-where plainly enough affirms, (*Point 38, Num. 5, Pag. 258*) where having spoken of the Vision of *Judas Machabew*, 2 *Machab. 15* and *12*, wherein he saw *Onias* the High Priest, (and Chief of God's People) Dead, and *Jeremiab* the Prophet dead long before, praying for the People of the *Jews*.) He adds, *We have from thence, that the most holy High Priest, and Chief of God's only*  
*People,*



*People believed the Saints prayed for us,  
 and helped us ; and that all the People  
 (who were said to be encouraged by  
 this Vision) were of the same Belief.  
 How far is this from all Novelty?  
 which can be proved to be practised  
 before the Days of the Apostles, &c.  
 Now, what is the Practice which  
 he affirms can be proved from the  
 History of the Machabees, to be  
 clear of all Novelty, and to have  
 been in Use in these Days ? He  
 must, if he will acknowledge him-  
 self to have written Sense, confess,  
 he meant the Practice of praying  
 to Saints ; so that under the Old  
 Testament there could not be any  
 such Thing as Invocation of Saints,*

departed this Life, *laudably* practised;  
 and yet such a Thing there was  
 even under the *Old Testament* pra-  
 ctised, and that *laudably*. What a  
 rare Art have these Men, of recon-  
 ciling both Parts of a Contradiction?  
 But it is no Wonder that this *little*  
 Author hath in this Controversy  
 split himself against the Rock of so  
 evident a Contradiction: Seeing  
 there that *Great Bellarmine* himself  
 also underwent the same Fate be-  
 fore him. For he, as well as our  
*Catholick Scripturist*, produceth di-  
 vers Texts out of the *Old Testament*,  
 to prove Invocation of Saints, in  
 the Place where he treats of that  
 Subject; but other-where, he makes  
 this

this ingenious Confession: \* Before the Coming of Christ, the Saints, which died, entered not into Heaven, neither did they see God ; nor could they ordinarily know the Prayers of those that supplicated to them ; and therefore it was not the Custom for Men under the Old Testament to say, Holy Abraham pray for me ; but the Men of those Times only prayed to

F 2

God.

---

\* Ante Christi adventum Sancti qui moriebantur non intrabant cælum, nec Deum videbant, nec cognoscere poterant ordinariè preces supplicantium. Ideò non fuit consuetum in V. Test. ut diceretur, Sancte Abraham, ora pro me ; sed solum orabant homines ejus temporis Deum. Bel. l. i. c. 9. de Beat. Sanct.

God. Where, by the Way, your Ladyship may please to observe, that *Bellarmino* expressly confesseth, that *Men under the Old Testament prayed only unto God*, and therefore not to the Saints ; no, nor Angels neither. But the Author of the *Catholick Scripturist* (as indeed *Bellarmino* himself other-where) professedly maintained, that Men, under the *Old Testament*, at least, prayed unto the holy Angels. What sincere Christian is there, (who hath his Eyes open to see these Things) who doth not abominate such egregious Prevarications in the great Matters of Salvation.

§. 8. Let



§. 8. Let us now come to the *New Testament* : And here, before we enter upon the Testimonies produced for Invocation of Saints out of the *New Testament*, we have this strong Prejudice against it : That if Men under the *Old Testament*, (wherein Christ, as *Mediator*, was not clearly reveal'd ; and the Saints knew not (at least generally) the new and living Way of drawing nigh unto God, and offering up their Prayers in the Name of Christ ; whence our Saviour himself, just before his Death, saith of his Apostles, who were born and bred in the *Jewish* Religion, that hitherto they had ask'd nothing in his Name,

*John*

*John* 16 and 24. I say, if Men under the *Old Testament* could make a Shift to pray to God acceptably, without the Mediation of Saints, then much more may we do well enough without it now under the Gospel, wherein Christ, the only Mediator between God and Man, is perfectly and fully revealed; but I shall let this pass, (though it be an Observation that utterly overthrows all Necessity of using the Mediation of Saints under the *New Testament*) and follow the Steps of the *Catholick Scripturist*. Concerning the four Gospels we have his full Confession (*Point 38, Num. 1, Page 253.*) in these Words: *The four*  
*Gospels*

Gospels writ no farther than the  
 Ascension of Christ into Heaven ;  
 before which no Saint also was in  
 Heaven ; whereof<sup>re</sup> you need not  
 wonder, that in the four Gospels  
 you see no Mention of praying to  
 Saints in Heaven. Indeed we do  
 not at all wonder at this, being  
 able to render a much better Ac-  
 count of this Silence of the four  
 Evangelists ; but we wonder much  
 at the impudent Sophistry of this  
 Writer, who, within a few Pages  
 after he had made this Confession,  
 (viz. Num. 6. †) cited two Testi-  
 monies

---

† See also Point 37, Num. 4. p. 248.

monies out of the Evangelists, to prove Invocation of Saints, viz. Luke 16. and 27. and 9. of the same Chapter. He proceeds, in the very next Words, to the Epistles of St. Paul. † In St. Paul's Epistles (saith he) you find him begging Prayers of Saints on Earth: So Heb. 13. and 18. Pray for us. Seeing then that Prayer to Saints in Heaven is more beneficial for us, it is also (by manifest Consequence) more to be used by us. A Childish Sophism; so often and so shamefully baffled by our Writers, that I wonder again

---

† Pag. 253, 254. *See also Point 37. Page 452.*



gain at his Impudence in producing it, and that as a *Manifest Consequence*. Indeed, who sees not the Difference between the Communication of Prayers amongst the Faithful living on Earth, which the Scripture speaks of, and the Practice of Invocating Saints Departed, which the Papists defend. For, 1. To entreat a Saint living on Earth, that he would, together with us, pray unto God for the obtaining of any Benefit to us, is not *Religiously to Invoke* that Saint, but *Invite* him to the *Religious Invocation* of God on our Behalf: But the Papists, in their Invocation of Saints, do profess to give them

Religious Worship, and stilly maintain, (witness the *Catholick Scripturist* himself, *Point 36.*) that such Worship is due unto them; and accordingly they Invoke Saints with all the Circumstances of Religious Worship: They rashly *infringe* their Images, and exalt them on High, and fall prostrate before them, &c. 2. The Papists do not only desire the Saints to pray for them unto God, that he would help them, but also pray unto the Saints themselves that they would help them, and from them expect Help. This is apparent from many of their Offices; especially such as are directed to the *Blessed Virgin.*

*Virgin.* 3. When we beg the Prayers of a Saint on Earth, that is present with us, we attribute to him nothing above human Nature; but when Papists Invoke the Souls of Departed Saints, they ascribe to them a Power of hearing those that are absent; of hearing an infinite Number of Supplicants at a vast Distance from each other, praying to them at the same Time; and that of hearing them so, as to understand with what inward Affection they pray, and to know the Secrets of their Hearts, which are Powers above human Nature, though never so much exalted; yea, proper to God alone.

ods §. 9. All the remaining Texts produced by him out of the *New Testament*, are taken out of the dark and mysterious Book of the *Revelations*. And though it be in a serious Matter, a Man can hardly restrain his Laughter, that observes how pleasantly he argues from them. The first Text cited, (*Point 38, Num. 6, Pag. 258.*) is *Revel. 2. and 26, 27. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my Words unto the End, to him will I give Power over the Nations, and he shall rule them with a Rod of Iron; as the Vessels of a Potter, they shall be broken to Shivers.* Bless us! What

Argu-



Argument can the Conjuror raise out of this Text, to prove Invocation of Saints? *The Saints* (saith he) *having Authority to Rule over the Nations so powerfully (as is here expressed by a Rod or Scepter of Iron) they exercise this their Power chiefly, by making Intercession so powerfully to God for us, as to obtain for us such Graces as we stand most in Need of.* A forcible Collection, if your Ladyship shall please to grant the poor Beggar these two Suppositions: 1. That these Texts speak of the Souls of the Saints Departed in the State of Separation, and in the Interval, between their Death and

and the last Resurrection\*. That  
 to rule the Nations with a Rod of  
 Iron, and to break them in Pieces as  
 a Potter's Kessel, signifyeth, to make  
 Intercession so powerfully to God for  
 them, as to obtain for them such  
 Graces as they must stand in Need  
 of. Another Text is, Revel. 5. and  
 8. The four Beasts, and the four  
 and twenty Elders, fell before the  
 Lamb, having every one Harps and  
 Golden Vials full of Odour, which  
 are the Prayers of the Saints. Here  
 again, your Ladyship must be so  
 kind

---

\* The Texts seem to intend the Judiciary Power  
 which the Saints shall receive at Christs second  
 Coming, or at the Day of Judgment: Of which  
 read Matt. 19. 28. 1 Cor. 6. 2, 3.

kind to the Author, as to grant, that the four Beasts and four and twenty Elders are the Souls of Departed Saints in the State of Separation, which indeed would be a liberal Concession. If he asks me, what else is meant by the four Beasts and the four and twenty Elders? I answer, in the Words of *Cajetan*, (a learned Writer of their own) concerning this whole Book of the *Revelation*, *Let him that can, Expound it* \* *St. Austin*, by the four Beasts, understands the the four Evangelists; (of which

St.

---

† Lib. I. de Concordia.  
\* For convenient interpretation.  
\* *Expōnat, qui potest.*

St. John, who wrote the Revelation, was one) and shews from some † Writers before him, how aptly they are signified by the four several Beasts described by St. John, Revel. 4. 6, 7. And Zegerus, a learned Expositor among the Romanists, tells us, that\* *Interpreters for the most Part agree in This, that the four Beasts signify the four Evangelists.* H. Grotius, by the four Beasts, understands the four Apostles, or Apostolical Persons, then at Jerusalem. By the twenty (of which four

---

† Lib. 1. de Consens. Evang.

\* Fere consentiunt Interpretes, 4 Animalia, 4 Evangelistas accipientes. Zeger. in Apoc. 4. 6, 7.




four Elders, the † most learned  
 Interpreters understand, the Gover-  
 nors and Bishops of the Church in  
 St. *John's* Time, who (say they)  
 are therefore reckoned twenty four,  
 to answer to the twenty four  
 Courses of the Priests appointed  
 by *David* under the *Old Testament*,  
*Chron.* 24. Surely the \* *Greek*  
 Word, which St. *John* here useth,  
 signifieth Presbyters, or Priests;  
 and I hope the Papists, though  
 they embrace for Oracles the idle  
 Dotages of their Counterfeit *Dio-*  
*nysius*, concerning the Hierarchy of  
 H Angels,

---

† *Vid.* Lyrum Zeger. & Grot. in Apoc. 4. 4.

\* ἑρμηνευται.

Angels, yet  will not dream so far, as to fancy an Order of Presbyters among the Spirits of just Men made perfect. Besides, it appears that the Prayers which these four Beasts and the twenty four Elders had in their Golden Vials, were their *own* Prayers; and those not *Petitionary*, but *Eucharistical*; not *Petitions*, but *Thanksgivings*. I say this appears from the Words immediately following, v. 9. wherein they are said, in a solemn Hymn, to have given Thanks to Christ for their Redemption; and the Redemption of the whole Church by the Blood of Christ. And, however, let the four Beasts  
and

and twenty four Elders, or Presbyters, be what the *Catholick Scripturist* shall please to fancy them ; yet it is certain, that in this Text there is not the least Intimation of any Prayers made, or any Religious Worship performed to them. His last Text is, *Revel. 8. v. 3 and 4. And another Angel came and stood at the Altar, having a Golden Censor, and there was given to him much Incense, that he should offer it, with the Prayers of all Saints, upon the Golden Altar which was before the Throne: And the Smoke of the Incense, which came with the Prayers of the Saints, ascended up before God out of the Angel's Hand.* To this I answer, *First,*

This Text concerns the Angels only, and hath not the least Relation to the Saints departed; and we are now enquiring chiefly concerning Invocation of Saints. 2<sup>dly</sup>, This Text is variously interpreted by the Writers of the Church of Rome themselves. \* Some expounding this Angel, of Christ, others, of Michael the Arch-Angel, others, of the Angels in general. 3<sup>dly</sup>, This Text describeth only a *Prophetical Vision*; wherein, to conceit every Thing to be real and argumentative, would be as absurd, as to argue from all

---

\* Vide Zegerum in ~~Loc.~~ Loc.



all the little Circumstances of a Parable, (which, indeed, is the usual Way of arguing of the *Catholick Scripturist*; for Want of better *Topicks*;) and then we must fancy an *Altar* before the *Throne* of God, and a Golden Censor in the Hand of the Angel, and *Incense* burnt therein, and the *Smoak* thereof ascending before the Throne of God; that is, we must turn the Text into *Smoak*. 4thly, Let the Papiſts make their best Advantage of this Text, it will appear to be nothing to their Purpose: The utmost that can be gathered from hence is, that the Angels are conscious to some Prayers of the Saints on Earth, as being present (especially)

ally) at the publick Services of the Church, and beholding the Decorum used there, 1 Cor. 11. 10. And what sober Protestant ever denied this? 2. That those blessed Spirits, as they do descend from their heavenly Habitations, to take Notice of the Services performed by us *Mortals*, so they ascend to Heaven again, and (as it were) make their *Returns*, and give a *Report* of what they hear and see to be done and performed of us. 3. That they join their Devotions with ours, their heavenly *Hallelujahs* with our imperfect Praises, yea, and their hearty *Amen* to all our Prayers; wishing, out of their fervent Charity  
and

and burning Love, all the good Things unto us that we pray for.

And all this is acknowledged by some Writers of the Church in the purer Ages, (as your Ladyship will by and by understand) who yet never acknowledged the Invocation of Angels, much less of Saints, but utterly rejected both, as derogatory to the Honour of God and Christ the Mediator. And the *Catholick Scripturist* himself, (as great a Stock of Confidence as he hath) durst not affirm, that the Prayers of the Saints, mentioned in this Text, and said to be offered up by the Angel, were made to the Angel himself, but

but to God. So he tells us, immediately before his Citation of this Text, *that Raphael offered up the Prayers made (to whom?) to God by Toby.* And then, what is all this to his Purpose? §. 10. Let us now (with your Ladyship's Leave) cast up the Account, and we shall find the total Sum of all the Texts, that can, with any Colour of Reason be pretended by our Catholick Scripturist to prove Invocation of Saints, to amount to a very slender Number; for, by his own Confession, all the Texts alledged out of the *Old Testament*, are to be deducted (which are the greatest Number) as *Impertinent,*



*inent*, yea, *Sophistically* produced,  
 seeing 'tis acknowledged not only  
 that there was not, but that there  
 could not be any such Thing as  
 Invocation of Saints taught under  
 the *Old Testament*, no Saint being  
 then in Heaven. Upon the same  
 Ground all the Texts alledged out  
 of the four Gospels are to be de-  
 ducted also, because none of them  
 reach any farther than Christ's  
 Ascension, before which Time,  
 no Saint was yet in Heaven ; so  
 that when your Ladyship meets  
 with any Text for Invocation of  
 Saints, cited out of any Book of  
 Scripture, from *Genesis* to the End  
 of *St. John's Gospel*, you may be  
 I assured

assured, from the Confession of the Papists themselves, that it is nothing to the Purpose ; and the few remaining Texts out of St. Paul's *Epistles* and the *Revelation* of St. *John*, your Ladyship hath seen also how impertinent they are. And now, what is become of that Formidable and *Numerous Army* of Scripture Testimonies for *praying to Saints*, which the Author had with so much Ostentation brought into the Field, to encourage the *Roman Catholick*, and to affright the Protestant Reader, and to abuse both? It is gone, and vanished, and there appears not one Text that will stand the

the Ground in Defence of so desperate a Cause.

§. 11. But there is one Text in the *New Testament*, (which the *Catholick Scripturist* himself is forced to produce) wherein the Religious Worship (and <sup>to</sup> the Invocation) of Angels, and therefore much more of Saints, is plainly forbidden: The Text is, *Coloss. 2. 18 and 19. Let no Man beguile you of your Reward, in a voluntary Humility and Worshipping of Angels, intruding into those Things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up with his fleshly Mind, and not holding the Head, &c.* Where the Apostle expressly forbids the Religious Worship of Angels, and ob-

viates also the specious Pretence of the *Romanists*, whereby they endeavour to colour that unchristian Practice. The Pretence is *Humility*, and that they dare not, in their Prayers, by Reason of their Unworthiness, approach immediately unto God, but by Degrees and Steps, addressing themselves to the Holy Angels, and by them making their Supplications to Almighty God. The Apostle assures us, that this Pretence is a meer Cheat and Fraud, serving to no other Purpose than to beguile Souls ; <sup>and that</sup> (this Pretence notwithstanding) the Practice of Invocating and Worshipping Angels is both vain and sinful. 1. Vain  
and



and rash ; because hereby Men † intrude into those Things they have not seen. They know not the Nature and Names, the distinct Orders and Offices of Angels, or when they are present and when not ; and yet they pray unto them and worship them. 2. Sinful and wicked ; for hereby they, after a Sort, forsake Christ, and hold not the Head of Angels, Principalities, and Powers ; that is, they do not acknowledge Christ, the Head of all Angels, Principalities, and Powers, to be a sufficient Mediator between God and Man ; but seek out for other Mediators

---

† α' ιδ' εναντι μωσαϊσμου.

diators beside him. Now, what saith the *Catholick Scripturist* to this Text? I beseech your Ladyship seriously to weigh the Answers which he gives, *Point 36, Num. 8. Page 242, 243.* He tells us, that *St. Paul* could not forbid the Worship of Angels, which *St. John* practised, &c. *Revel. 19. and 10. and c. 22. and 8.* Why not? Seeing the Angel himself to whom *St. John* offered to perform that Worship, forbid it and refused it. But (saith the Sophister) he forbid it not as unlawful, but as unbecoming the Dignity of *St. John*, who was a very great Prophet and Apostle; and, by his Office, equal to Angels.

How

How vain this Shift is your Ladyship will easily discern; if you consider, the Angel, in the Texts cited, forbids the Worship which St. *John* was about to give him, by such Reasons as equally extend to all Christians : 1. He tells him, \* he was his *Fellow-Servant*, no Master of his, to be worshipped by him ; but a Creature, obliged to worship and serve the supream God, no less than himself. 2. He expressly forbids this Worship offered to him by St. *John*, as due only to God ; for in both the Texts cited, after the Angel had forbidden St. *John*

He to

to worship him, he adds, *Worship God*; as if he should say, That Worship which thou art about to offer me, is due only to God, and therefore to him alone do thou give it. 3. In the latter Text, cited *Rev. 22.* and *9,* there is an express Clause, which is so *general,* as to comprehend all other Christians, no less than *St. John,* or the Prophets and Apostles, as not obliged, yea, forbidden to worship Angels. The Words are, *I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of the Brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the Sayings of this Book*; that is, all obedient Christians, which therefore are by this Text no less

ex-



exempted from the Worship of Angels than St. *John* himself was. But he urgeth, By this you make St. *John* guilty of Idolatry, in worshipping an Angel, no less than you pretend us *Roman* Catholicks to be. I answer, this is most false; for we say, that St. *John*, surprized with the Heavenly Glory, and transported with the glad Tidings of the Marriage-Supper, in the former Text, and the Vision of the Heavenly *Jerusalem* in the Latter, worshipped the Angel, that was the Messenger of the one, and the Revealer of the other, not knowing, or at least not considering, who he was, and being warned, forbore to

K proceed

proceed in that his Error and Mistake. But the Papists knowingly, wittingly, deliberately, and professedly worship Angels, and being warned by this Example of St. *John*, and the express Prohibition of St. *Paul*, and many other Admonitions of Scripture, will not give it over, but still obstinately persist in their sinful Practice.

But I wonder the *Catholick* *Scripturist* should so far forget his own Catechism; for the *Trent* Catechism (which I am sure he dares not disown) expressly acknowledgeth,\* that the Honour that St. *John* was about  
to

---

\* *In Explic. Præcept. 1.*

to give unto the Angel, was an Honour due unto God only ; and, upon that Account, forbidden ; and some of the most † learned Authors among the Romanists acknowledge the same. But, Illy, Let us examine the direct Answer which he gives to the above-cited Text, in these Words : \* *The Truth is, St. Paul speaks only of such Religious Worship of Angels, as had been taught among the Jews by Simon Magus, who would have Sacrifice offered to all Angels, as well Evil as Good; &c. And this is that which is*

K 2

con-

---

† Vide Baron. *Annal.* Tom. 1. ad Ann. 60.

\* Greg. de Valentia, Lib. 1. de Idolatria, Cap. 4.

*condemned in the Council of Laodicea.*

\* The plain Sense of which Answer is this: That St. Paul forbids not the Worship of good Angels, but only of bad Angels, or Devils. But sure the *Catholick Scripturist* is a Man of a very forlorn Understanding, if he really believes this Answer to be <sup>the</sup> Truth; for St. Paul prohibits the Worship of Angels in general. Now if he had meant, that good Angels may be worshipped, but bad not, he ought to have made a Distinction, unless he in-

---

\* Coster. *Enchirid.* Cap. 22. fol. Object. 7.

*Aquin. Secunda Secunda Quaest. 84.*



intended grossly to deceive his Reader. 2. St. Paul speaks of all those Angels and Principalities of which Christ is the Head, 10 and 19 vers. And I hope the good Angels are not to be excluded from this Number. Nay, Christ, in the most proper Sense, is the Head of the good Angels alone. 3. St. Paul speaks to a Christian Church, *The Saints and faithful Brethren which are at Collossos*, Chap. 1. v. 2. These he cautions to take Heed of the Worship of Angels; and implies, that they were prone to that Worship which he forbids. Now sure they were very sorry Saints, that were inclined to worship Devils. 4. He tells us  
also,

also, that the Angel-worship which he forbids, was gilded over with a specious Pretence, with a Shew of Humility, viz. in not daring to approach the supream God, but by his Ministers, the holy Angels. But what specious Pretence could there be for the Worship of *Devils*, the Enemies of God? What Shew of Humility, or any other Christian Virtue, could set off so Hellish and damnable a Practice? I should dishonour your Ladyship's Understanding, if I should dwell any longer in the Refutation of so senseless an Interpretation: So that from the Text of St. Paul, (notwithstanding all the Cavils of the *Catholick* *Scripturist*)

*Scripturist*, I have Leave to conclude, That the Worship and Invocation of Angels (and therefore much more of Saints departed) is sinful and unlawful. What he adds concerning the Council of *Laodicea*, that this Devil-worship was the only Thing condemned by the Fathers thereof, all the Learned know to be an impudent Falshood. They condemn the same Worship of Angels which *St. Paul* forbids; and their Decree hath Respect to the same Countries, which the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Colossians* condemns. For *Laodicea*, where that Council assembled, was the *Metropolis* of *Phrygia*, and not far from *Colossos* ;  
 fo

so that it seems, the same superstitious Practice of Worshipping Angels, which had its Beginning among the *Colossians* in St. Paul's Time, took such deep Root, as to continue in that Part of the World till the Time of the Council of *Laodicea*, that is above two hundred Years after ; which again renders it utterly improbable, that this Angel-Worship should be the Worship of evil Angels or Devils ; for so detestable a Practice could not continue so long, at least, among those that still bore the Name of Christians, such as the Persons concerned in the Decree of the Council of *Laodicea*, are expressly acknowledged to



ed to be. In a Word, that Council doth in general Terms, and without any Distinction, forbid Christians to † name; that is, Invoke, or pray unto *Angels*:

§. 12. I have this to add concerning Invocation of Saints, in Reference to the *New Testament*, (if after what hath been said, it be not superfluous to add any Thing more) that whereas the *Catholick Scripturist* (as we have heard) \* professedly lays down this as the Ground of his Discourse concerning  
 L pray-

---

† Ἀγγέλους ἐνομαλίζειν, i. e. *Angelos invocare. Vide* 2 Tim. c. 2. com. 11. collat. cum. 1 Cor. c. 1. com. 2. *De verâ autem Concilii Sententiâ conf. Zonar. Comm. in Concil. Laodic. Canon 35.*

\* See also Point 37. Num. 2.

praying to Saints : That the Saints, when they die, go immediately to the Third Heaven, and there enjoy the *Beatifick Vision*. This Foundation is utterly subverted by the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church* in the First Ages : For the Church of God for some Ages after the Apostles believed, that the Souls of the Faithful, in the State of Separation, though they are in a happy Condition in *Paradise*, yet are not in the Third Heaven, nor do enjoy the *Beatifick Vision* 'till the Resurrection. If the *Author of the Letter*, or the *Catholick Scripturist* shall deny this, I will forfeit all my Credit with your Ladyship, if I do

I do not fully prove it by very many, and very manifest Testimonies, out of Primitive Antiquity : Nay, this was a Doctrine so generally received in the Time of *Justin Martyr*, \* that is, in the first Succession of the Apostles, that we learn from the same *Justin*, that there were none but some profligate *Hereticks*, that believed the Souls of the Faithful, before the Resurrection, to be received into Heaven it self : And indeed the Scriptures of the *New Testament*, as they do assure us, that the Souls of the Faithful, de-

L 2      parted

---

\* *Dialog. cum Tryphone*, p. 306, 307, Edit. Paris, 1636. Vide & pag. 223.

departed this Life, are in *Abraham's Bosom*, (*Luke* 16 and 23) or in *Paradise*, (*Luke* 23. 43.) So they do plainly enough intimate, that *Paradise* and the *Third Heaven* are distinct Places, 2 *Cor. c.* 12, and *v.* 2, 3, 4. And so \* the *Jews*, from whom the Notion and very Term of *Paradise* was derived, universally believed ; and 'tis most certain, that our Saviour Christ, whose Soul went to *Paradise* presently, upon his Death, ascended not to the *Third Heaven* 'till after his Resurrection. Now, the particular Knowledge which the Saints, departed,

---

\* *Vide* Grot. in *Lucæ*, c. 23 & 43.



parted, are supposed to have of Things done upon Earth, depends, according to the Papist, on their enjoying the *Beatifick Vision* ; and upon this Knowledge, the particular Intercession of the Saints in Heaven is founded, and that again is the Foundation of *Invocation of Saints*. Hence it follows, that the prime Foundation of *Invocation of Saints*, laid by the Papists, is overthrown by the general Consent of the purest and best Ages of the Church of Christ, and that most agreeably also to the Scriptures of the *New Testament*.

§. 13. And, accordingly, it is very apparent, that there was no such Thing practised in the Church, (by the Catholicks, I mean) as Invocation of Saints, for at least three hundred Years after Christ. Let the Author of the Letter produce any one Testimony to the Purpose, out of any Writer of these Ages, that is not by learned Men of his own Party acknowledged and confessed to be supposititious and forged, and I will yield them the whole Cause in this Controversy. This is a very liberal Offer ; and yet I will stand to it, and do not fear in the least, that the Protestant Cause will be any Loser by it.

Nay,

Nay, it is manifest, that the Church of Christ, in those purer Ages, professedly disowned the Invocation of any Creature, Saint, or Angel, as derogatory to the Honour of God, who alone is to be Invoked, thro' *Christ*, the only Mediator. I will give your Ladyship one illustrious Testimony, that shall reach as far as about two hundred and fifty Years after Christ. \**Origen*, defending the Christian Religion against *Celsus*, a profane Derider of it, and answering a Cavil of his concerning the holy Angels, declares the Opinion and Practice of the Christian

---

\* *Contra Cels.* l. 5. p. 233. *Edit. Cantab.*

ftian Church, in his Age, in these  
 exprefs Words : We confefs, in-  
 deed, that the Angels are certain  
 Miniftring Spirits, fent forth by God  
 to minifter unto them that are Heirs  
 of Salvation ; and that they do one  
 while afcend to the pure cœleftial  
 Places, yea, to the purer fuper-cœleftial  
 Regions, offering up the Prayers of  
 Men ; another while defcend from  
 thence, bringing back to every Man,  
 as he is found worthy, fomewhat of  
 thofe Things they are appointed by God  
 to minifter unto them that are favour-  
 ed by him. Thefe Spirits we are  
 taught, from their Office, to call An-  
 gels ; and we find, that by Reason of  
 a certain Divinity that is in them,  
 they



they are sometimes in the Scripture called Gods ; yet this is not to be understood, as if we were commanded to adore them, or give them divine Worship, although they minister and convey the good Things of God unto us. For all Prayers, all Intercessions, Deprecations, and Thanksgivings, ought to be directed to God, the Lord of all Things, by our High Priest, who is greater than all Angels, the living Word and God. For to invoke the Angels without the Knowledge of them, of which Mortals are incapable, would be unreasonable. And if we should suppose, that we could attain the admirable and hidden Knowledge of them, so as to understand their Na-

M

ture

*ture and several Offices, yet this would not warrant us with Confidence to invoke any other besides the Supreme God, who is abundantly able to supply all our Wants, by our Saviour the Son of God. And this is enough to make the Angels our Friends, and ready to do us any good Office, that we are pious towards God, and, as far as our Mortal Nature is able, imitate their Virtues, who themselves also do imitate God.*

I beseech your Ladyship seriously to weigh the several Things contained in this Testimony. This antient and famous Writer doth here plainly teach, 1. That the Angels who stand before the Face  
of

of God in Heaven, are by no means to be invocated ; much less then the Saints, who are supposed by the Church of God (as we have before shewn) to be (yet at least) *a little lower than the Angels.* 2. That the Angels are blessed Instruments, betwixt God and us, of conveying our Prayers to God, and the Good Things of God to us, and yet are not to be invocated ; how much less then the Saints departed, to whom no such *Ordinary Ministry* is attributed, either in Scripture or Antiquity ? 3. That the Angels are called in Scripture Gods, which is more than the Souls of the Departed Saints are, and yet they are

not to be invocated. 4. That Invocation is a Part of Divine Worship, and therefore not to be given to any Creature. And therefore, 5. That all Sorts of Prayers are to be directed to God only, by Christ, the only Mediator, and that we have no Warrant to direct them to any other. 6. That to invoke God in Christ, is sufficient, without having Recourse to any other Mediators; because God alone is able to supply all our Wants. 7. That the Pretence of those that tell us, that it is a prudent Course to pray to Angels, that so we may make them our Friends, and procure them to use their Interest in Heaven



Heaven in our Behalf, is vain ; because the best and only Way to procure Friendship of these Blessed Spirits, is sincerely to serve and worship God alone, according to our Measures, as they do. I know not how all the Cavils and little Pretences of the *Romanists*, in this Question, could have been more clearly obviated in so few Words.

8. All this he delivers as the known and professed Doctrine of the Church in his Time, opposed to the Philosophy of the Heathen, concerning Worshipping of *Demons*. And who sees not, if there had been any such Practice of Invocating Saints or Angels amongst Christians

stians in those Days, as is now in the Church of *Rome*, the Objection of *Celsus* would have been perfectly groundless and ridiculous, and the Answer of *Origen* a gross Falshood.

To return thither from whence I have somewhat digressed from the Premisses, it manifestly appears, that according to the Principles acknowledged by the *Papists* themselves, there could be no such Thing as Invocation of Saints recommended or practised in the Old Testament; and that according to the Grounds received by the Primitive Christians, that lived nearest to the Apostles, (and who certainly,  
if

if the Apostles had taught either by Writing <sup>o</sup> Moral Tradition any such Practice, could not be so universally ignorant thereof) *Invocation of Saints* is not, cannot be taught or delivered in the New Testament, and, consequently, that the Author of the *Catholick Scripturist* declares himself an Egregious Sophister, when he undertakes to prove their Doctrine by clear Texts out of both the Old and New Testament. And therefore some more learned and ingenious <sup>u</sup> Papists (who had not so hard a Forehead as the *Catholick Scripturist*) have plainly, and in down right Terms acknowledged, That the Practice of their Church,

in

in Praying to Saints, is no where taught in the Old or New Testament. To omit others, that I might cite if I had Room and Leisure, we have a full Confession of \* *Barmes*, a known Author among the *Romanists*; *That Prayers* (saith he) *are to be made to Saints, the Holy Scriptures do neither expressly nor covertly teach us.*

§. 14. I have one Instance more, (fresh in my Memory) wherein the Fraud and Deceit of the *Catholick Scripturist* is very conspicuous. One of the Points he undertakes to prove out of Scripture, is the *Half Com-*

---

\* *Orationes esse ad Sanctos faciendas, neque expresse neque involutè sacra litera docent. 2. 2. Quæst. Art. 10.*



*munions*, or receiving the Sacrament  
 only in One Kind, *viz.* the Bread,  
 practised and (not only so, but) in-  
 joined in the Church of *Rome*. I  
 know your Ladyship to be well  
 versed in the Holy Scriptures, and  
 therefore humbly beseech you only  
 to recollect what you have read  
 therein concerning this Matter;  
 as, That our Saviour instituted and  
 commanded the Sacrament to be re-  
 ceived in both Kinds, *Matthew* 26.  
 26, 27, 28; and that every Insti-  
 tution and Command of Christ,  
 especially in so important a Matter,  
 as is the great Sacrament and most  
 Mysterious Rite of Christianity,  
 ought with all possible Care and Ex-  
 actness

actness of Religion to be observed,  
 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, 25: That St.  
*Paul*, in Pursuance of our Saviour's  
 Institution, enjoins, that every  
 Christian, after due Examination,  
 should not only *eat of the Bread*,  
 but also *drink of the Cup* in the Sa-  
 crament, 1 Cor. 11. 28. That it  
 appears the Apostolick Church did  
 accordingly receive the Sacrament  
 in both Kinds, 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27,  
 29. and 10. 21.) and then I shall  
 leave it to your Ladyship's Consci-  
 ence to judge of the intolerable Im-  
 pudence of those *Hectors* in Divi-  
 nity, who dare undertake the Proof  
 of such Things out of Scripture, as  
 may be discerned by all to be mani-  
 festly

festly repugnant thereunto. Indeed, that the *Romanists* have no Ground in Scripture, or primitive Antiquity, to rob the Laity of one half of the Communion, is plainly confessed by that very Council which first established this Sacrilege; I mean the *Council of Constance*. For the Fathers of that Council (if it be lawful to give that venerable Title to a sorry Convention of Men, so wholly regardless of the Command of Christ, and the Practice of the Apostolick Church, yea, of the whole Church of God, for \*

N 2

many

---

\* *De Administratione S. S. Sacramenti Eucharistiae satis compertum est, Universalem Christi Ecclesiam*

many Ages after) in exprefs Terms acknowledge, that Chrift instituted the Sacrament to be received in both Kinds, yea, that it was fo adminiftred and received in the Primitive Church; yet with a *Non obftante*, notwithstanding all this, they boldly and blaſphemouſly decree againſt Communion in both Kinds, as a Thing dangerous and ſcandalous; and the Decree denounceth *Excommunication* to the Prieſt that ſhall dare to adminiſter the

---

*am in hunc uſque diem, Occidentalem vero ſeu Romanam mille amplius à Chriſto annis in ſolenni præſertim & ordinaria hujus Sacramenti Diſpenſatione utramque Panis & Vini ſpeciem omnibus Eccleſie membris exhibuiſſe. Caſſand. Conſult. Artic. 12. De utraque Specie Sacrament.*



the Sacrament as Christ appointed. I wrong them not. All this is plainly delivered in the *thirteenth Session* of that Council. And think you not, Madam, that those were rare *Scripturists*? What Christian is there, that bears any due Honour to Christ, or Respect or Reverence to his Commands, whose Soul doth not rise up against such an Anti-christian Decree? But where lies the Danger and Scandal of Communicating in both Kinds, that the Council speaks of? Cardinal \* *Cajetan* (who was best able to explain this Mystery) tells us in these Words: *It is morally impossible that*

---

\* In 3 *Aquin. Quæst.* 80.

*that so many People should communicate in both Kinds, without spilling the Blood under the Species of Wine : Now, to expose the Blood of Christ to this Danger is an Act of Irreverence, yea, a Sacrilege, imputable to the People and their Governors. He adds, That this is the chief and solid Foundation of the Custom introduced of the Peoples communicating in one Kind only. I confess I could not read these Words of Cajetan without Horror. For doth it not here follow, that Christ, by instituting the Sacrament in both Kinds, (I tremble again to utter it) unavoidably exposed his own Blood to Irreverence and Sacrilege? That*  
*the*

the whole Primitive Church (where-  
in Communion in both Kinds is  
confessed by the Papists themselves  
to be practised) both the People,  
and their Bishops, and Governors,  
were chargeable with Irreverence  
and Sacrilege done to the Blood of  
Christ; or, to speak in *St. Paul's*  
Phrase, were guilty of the Blood  
of our Lord?

But who sees not that the Sacri-  
lege is here chargable on the Church  
of *Rome*, which hath robbed the  
Faithful of one Half of the Blessed  
Sacrament, the Cup of our Lord,  
to which they had a Right by the  
Institution of Christ, and the hap-  
py Enjoyment and Possession where-  
of

of they were invested with by the  
 Prescription and Practice of the  
 Catholick Church, for many Ages  
 together after the Apostles? For  
 when they tell us, that the People  
 receive a perfect Sacrament only in  
 one Kind, because both the Body  
 and Blood of Christ are truly and  
 perfectly contained under each *Spe-*  
*cies* of the Sacrament, they egregi-  
 ously prevaricate in a Matter of  
 great Concernment to the Souls of  
 Men. For, 1. If this be true,  
 then our Saviour did superfluously  
 institute the Sacrament to be re-  
 ceived in both Kinds: For if there  
 be a perfect Sacrament in one Kind  
 only, to what Purpose did Christ  
 to in-



institute the other ? 2. It is most false, that the Body and Blood of Christ are Sacramentally in each Element : For 'tis the Bread only that doth Sacramentally signify and exhibit the Body of Christ, and the Wine only that doth Sacramentally signify and exhibit the Blood of Christ. 3. That which doth not perfectly represent and set forth the Death and Passion of our Lord, is no perfect Sacrament ; (for this is the very End of this Divine Institution, *to shew forth the Lord's Death*, 1 Cor. 11. 26.) But Communion only in one Kind, *viz.* the Bread, doth not perfectly represent the Death and Passion of our

O

Lord

Lord Jesus. Therefore Communion only in one Kind is no perfect Sacrament. The Effusion and Shedding of Christ's Blood on the Cross, (which is so considerable a Part of his Passion, as that it is every where *emphatically* insisted on in the Scriptures of the New Testament, and Christ himself, in the very Institution of the Sacrament, urgeth it, when consecrating the Cup, he saith, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which was shed for many*, Matt. c. 26. v. 28. 1 Cor. c. 11. v. 25.) I say, this Effusion of Christ's Blood, is in the Communion only of the Bread so far from being *perfectly*, that it is not at *all*

re-

represented, but totally obscured. And therefore, 4. Some of the more ancient and learned Writers among the Papists themselves, have plainly confessed, that Communion in one Kind is but an imperfect Sacrament: \* So *Durandus*, *This Sacrament was ordained of God for a Spiritual Refection, which is signified by the Corporal; and it is not a perfect Refection, unless therein somewhat be propounded of Meat, and something of Drink.* So † *Tapperus*, *Although whole Christ be under both Species, yet he works according to the Signification of them; and under one useth his Body as an Instrument, un-*

---

\* *Lib. 4. Dist. 7. Qu. 1. pag. 693.*

† *Tapperus apud Cass. de Communionem sub utraque Specie, p. 1032.*

der the other his Blood. And seeing the Sacraments confer the Grace which they signify, where the Signification is more perfect, there the Effect also must needs be more full and compleat. And before these our Hælenfis, \* Receiving under both Kinds, (which Manner of Receiving our Lord delivered) is of greater Efficacy and Perfection. I leave it now to your Ladyship to judge how kind a Mother the Church of Rome is, which for so long a Time hath debarred her Sons of the Refreshment and Comfort of a perfect Sacrament, and condemned them to a mutilated, maimed, and half Communion.

---

\* Lib. 4. Quæst. 11. Mem. 3. p. 225.



on. Indeed, the Cause is so plain, that we might well wonder the Church of *Rome* hath not long since retracted this her rash, erroneous, and dangerous Determination, did we not know and were assured, that that Church (or rather Court) is swayed and guided wholly (not by the Maxims of Piety and Conscience, but) by carnal Policy. If she should recant and restore to the Faithful their Right to the Blessed Cup, it would follow, (they are the Words of \**Gerson*, a famous Writer among the Papists) *that the Church of Rome hath hither-*

---

\* *Sequeretur Ecclesiam Romanam hactenus non idem sensisse de hoc Sacramento, & Concilia Generalia in fide & bonis moribus errasse. Gerson. contra Hæres. de Communionem datâ ab utraq; Specie.*

to thought amiss concerning the Sacrament, and that General Councils have erred in Faith and good Manners. Vain Fear! For as for the former Branch of the Consequence, 'tis manifest and cannot be deny'd; nor will the Proctors of the Church of Rome, with all their Sophistry, be ever able to stave it off. As for the latter Part, it doth not follow, (at least from the Premises) for 'tis certain that the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent* (which established that wicked Decree) were not truly *General Councils*. But it were better to grant that Part of the Consequence also, rather than to affirm that Christ himself erred, in

ap-

appointing the Sacrament to be received in both Kinds; that the whole Church of Christ, under the Guidance of the Apostles themselves, erred, and were chargeable with Irreverence and Sacrilege against the Blood of our Lord; both which are unavoidable Consequences of admitting the Decree of the Council of *Constance* as true and certain.

By these Instances (to which many more might be added) your Ladyship may be satisfied how vain and perfectly false is the Pretence of the *Catholick Scripturist* and the Author of the *Letter*, when they profess to prove the Points in Contro-

troverſy; between them and us, by Scripture ; between which and their Tenets (for the moſt Part) there is the ſame Agreement, as between Light and Darkneſs, between Heaven and Hell.

§. 15. The Author of the *Letter* having adviſed your Ladyſhip to the Reading of the forementi-  
 oned Book, proceeds in the next Place to direct you in the Manner how to read it ; and here he is mighty earneſt, and again and again beſeecheth your Ladyſhip to *conſult your ſerious Reaſon*. Strange Advice from a *Roman Catholick* ! Will they then allow us to conſult our ſerious Reaſon in the Matter of  
 Re-



Religion This is all we desire from them, that they would not compell us to hoodwink our Reason, and to follow their Church in all Things by a blind implicit Faith: But stay; not too much of our serious Reason neither. The reasonable Liberty which he gives your Ladyship with one Hand, (and earnestly desires you to make Use of) he takes away with the other. For he presently adds, *and when any Thing shall occur to your Thoughts as falsely imputed Novelties in our Church* (he means sure when you meet with any Point in that Book, that is (although falsely) charged with Novelty, and shall seem such to your

P

La-

Ladyship even after the Use of your  
 serious Reason ; well, what then ?  
*be pleased, Madam, to turn to the*  
*12th Point, Numb. 2. Pag. 90. and*  
*you shall read there an Invincible*  
*Argument against any Possibility of*  
*Innovation in Matters of Faith.* The  
 plain Sense of which Advice is this :  
 I advise your Ladyship to consult  
 your serious Reason in the reading  
 of the Book call'd *The Catholick Scrip-*  
*turist* ; but yet you must take Heed  
 how you follow its Guidance : For  
 I foresee there are many Points  
 therein, which, after all that is said  
 in Defence of them by the Author,  
 will appear to your serious Reason,  
 when you have in the best Manner  
 con-

consulted it, perfect Novelties, and no Way consonant to the Holy Scripture: And therefore when your serious Reason consulted tells you, that the Church of *Rome* is guilty of Innovation in such Points, you must not believe it, but turn to such a Place in the Book, where you have an invincible Argument to prove that the Church of *Rome* is infallible, and cannot possibly be guilty of any Innovation. But to what Purpose is it for your Ladyship to consult your serious Reason in the several Points defended in that Book, if, when you have so done, you are still at a Loss, and must not trust any thing to it, but

only look to the Proof of that Point which concerns the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and from thence conclude the Truth of all the rest? That invincible Argument he speaks of I remember not; (indeed, I cannot remember that I met with any such throughout the whole Book,) but as soon as I see the Book again, (which I hope will be speedily) I shall give your Ladyship a particular Answer to it, and doubt not to do it with most ample Satisfaction. In the mean time, it may suffice to mind your Ladyship of the true State of the Question concerning the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church. We Protestants  
 pro-



profess and prove, by most evident  
 Arguments, that the Church of  
*Rome* hath in sundry Points erred,  
 and is guilty of Innovation. The  
 Patrons of that Church, not able  
 to answer those Arguments of ours,  
 tell us, this cannot be, that the  
 Church of *Rome* is Infallible, and  
 cannot possibly be guilty of such  
 Innovation. Is not this an admi-  
 rable Way of Reasoning and Dispu-  
 tation? Can the *Romanists* pro-  
 duce Arguments to prove that Their  
 Church cannot err, so clear and  
 evident as these alledged by us to  
 demonstrate that she hath erred?  
 Surely, No. To make this plain:  
 If I can be infallibly certain that  
 my

my Senses, rightly disposed, and all due Requisites to Sensation supposed, are infallible, and cannot be deceived about their proper Objects, (and if I cannot be assured of this, the Apostles had no <sup>infallible</sup> ~~possible~~ Assurance of that which is the Foundation of the Christian Faith, the Resurrection of Christ, which was evidenced to them by their Testimony of Sense, and that Testimony pronounced Infallible, *Act. 1. ver. 3.* \* *1 Job. 1. ver. 1, 2.*) then I may be infallibly certain that the Church of *Rome* is not Infallible,

---

\* *Recita Johannis Testationem, Quod vidimus, inquit, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, & manus contrectarunt de Sermone Vitæ. Falsa utique Testatio, si Oculorum, & Aurium, & Manuum Sensus Natura mentitur. Tertull. Lib. De Anim. Cap. 17.*

( III )

yea, that she hath grossly erred in her Doctrine of Transubstantiation, teaching the Bread and Wine, after the Words of Consecration, to be turned into the very Flesh and Blood of Christ, which yet all my Senses assure me to remain still the same in Nature and Substance, that is, Bread and Wine. If I can be infallibly certain, that Christ himself is Infallible, that he would not, could not appoint an Institution that should be dangerous and scandalous to his Church, *viz.* Of receiving the Holy Eucharist in both Kinds: If I can be infallibly certain that the whole Church of Christ, that was under the Guidance and Direction

tion of the Apostles, were not grossly deceived, and engaged by the Apostles themselves in a Practice dangerous and scandalous; (and of this I may be as infallibly sure, as I am of the Truth of the Gospel itself) then I may be infallibly certain, that the Church of *Rome* not only may err, but hath grossly erred in that Determination of hers, whereby she rejects (in the Council of *Constance*) Communion in both Kinds, as *a dangerous and scandalous Practice*. And in the same Manner we might proceed to shew the Falshood of divers other Determinations of the Church of *Rome*, if this Paper would permit :

But



But these are sufficient to any Person, that shall (according to the Advice of the Author of the *Letter*) *consult his serious Reasons*. Indeed, I look upon it as a wonderful both just and wise Providence of God, that he hath suffered the Church of *Rome* to fall into such gross Errors, (which, otherwise, it is scarce imaginable how Men in their Wits, that had not renounced, not only the Scriptures, but their Reason, yea, and their Senses too, could be overtaken with) and to *determine* them for *Articles of Faith*. For hereby a Person of the meanest Capacity (so he be sincere, and not under the Prejudice of Education)

Q

may

may evidently discern with what a strange Kind of Impudence that Church arrogates to her self an Infallibility in all her Determinations. And for such of our Church that have been informed of these Things, and yet shall leave our Communion, and follow the Guidance of that Church upon the Account of her Infallibility, I fear they are in the Number of those miserable Persons, described by the Apostle, *2 Thess. 2. 11, 12. who are given up to strange Delusions, that they may believe a Lye, &c.* That which follows in the Text I dread to mention; God avert it from them.

§. 16. A little after, the Author of the *Letter* adviseth your Ladyship to peruse the Table of the forementioned Book, and to select any one or more Points, which you conceive may most pinch the Papist, and to judge impartially of what you read, &c. I confess the Proposal is very fair and reasonable, but yet 'tis no more than what the Defence of his Cause necessarily obliged him to submit to. For such is the unhappy Condition of that Church, which arrogated ~~to~~ to herself Infallibility in all her Determinations, that she must equally defend them all ; and if she should be found to be mistaken in but one Instance, her whole Authority is

for ever blasted. I humbly beseech your Ladyship therefore to accept the Condition offered, and to pitch upon the Instances already given, demanding that Satisfaction which in the Sequel of his Letter he promiseth shall be given you *with all Fulness of Clarity.*

§. 17. As for that Undertaking of your Ladyship, (which he mentions) *to make appear our Church to be the only true Church, &c.* knowing your Ladyship's Wisdom and Prudence, I cannot believe you ever undertook any such Thing. None of us do affirm, that our Church is the only true Church; for that would be a *Schismatical Assertion,*



fertion, like that of the *Donatists*  
 of Old, and the *Papists* now-a-days,  
 and the highest Breach of Charity,  
 in damning all the Christian World  
 besides our selves. What we af-  
 firm is this, That our Church is a  
 true Church, in all the Respects  
 mentioned by the Author of the  
*Letter*, and also a pure Church;  
 and therefore such, as from which  
 no Man can separate, or desert her  
 Communion, without the Guilt of  
 Schism. This the Writers of our  
 Church have affirmed, and by ma-  
 ny large Volumes proved. If the  
 Author of the *Letter* can produce  
 any Thing, worth the taking Notice  
 of, to the contrary, I will engage  
 to

to your Ladyship (although I have my handful of other Work) to answer it. But it may be your Ladyship said, that our Church of all others, at this Day, is the *purest* and *best* Church, most conform to the Scripture and primitive Pattern. And this (although Comparisons are odious) is very *defensible*, and a *well-weighed* Truth, of which I have (ever since I was capable of Judging) been verily persuaded. But if the Comparison be made between the *Roman Church* and ours, he is stark blind, that sees not to which the Preference is due. For in the Points controverted between the Papists and us, (wherein alone the

Com-

Comparison can be framed, seeing in the rest we stand upon equal Terms,) 'tis very visible that we keep to the Rule of Scripture and the primitive Pattern, from which the Church of *Rome* hath widely deviated. And supposing (not granting) that the *Roman* Church could in the said Questions clear herself of the heavy Imputations of *Idolatry* and *Sacrilege*, charged on her by her Adversaries; yet she will never be able to acquit herself from *Innovation*, and the Guilt of receding from the Rule of *Scripture* and the primitive *Practice*. Nothing but Impudence itself (that is such a Thing as the Author of the *Catholic*

*tholick Scripturist*) dares affirm that  
 the Scriptures teach, or the primi-  
 tive Church practised, *Image-Wor-*  
*ship, Invocation of Saints, the Half*  
*Communion, Prayers in a Tongue not*  
*understood by them that are requi-*  
*red to join inthem, &c.* and there-  
 fore among the Papists themselves  
 some of the more ingenuous and  
 learned have confessed, That none  
 of these Things can be found either  
 in the Scriptures, or the Practice of  
 the Primitive Church. Besides, our  
 serious Reason, if consulted, (ac-  
 cording to the Advice of the Au-  
 thor of the *Letter*) will tell us, that  
 the Side on which our Church de-  
 termines in these Questions, is at  
 least



least *best* and *safest*. Suppose the Image-Worship, practised in the Church of Rome, were not *idolatrous*, yet sure it is *gross* and *carnal*; and to worship God, who is a Spirit, in Spirit and Truth, without Images and corporeal Representations, is a more *spiritual* and *generous* Worship, than that which is performed with and by them: And the best \* Plea which the Papists have made for these Images is, That they may be useful Books for Idiots and Fools to pore on. So if we should suppose that Invocation of Saints and Angels were not at all derogatory to the Honour of

R                      God,

---

\* *Idiotarum Libri.*

God, and Christ the Mediator ; yet seeing God hath no where commanded it, no where annexed any Promise thereunto in the Scriptures, it may be well doubted whether he will accept it. \* And seeing it is not, ~~we~~ cannot be certain, that the Saints are in a Capacity of understanding our particular Necessities, and hearing our Prayers ; neither can it be certain, that all the Prayers we make unto them are not *frustraneous*, and vainly poured out into the Air, without any Benefit or Advantage accruing to us by them. But we are sure that it

---

\* *Certa ratione nescimus, an Sancti nostra vota cognoscunt, quamvis pie hos credamus.* Cajetan in secundam duæ Quæst. 88. Art. 5.

is not only lawful for us, but our indispensable Duty to pray unto God, because he hath in a thousand Places expressly commanded us so to do: We are sure that he knows all our Wants and Necessities, and can hear our Prayers, as being Omniscient, and every where present; we are sure that the Prayers we offer up to him, agreeable to his Will, in the Name only of *Christ the Mediator*, shall be heard and accepted, God having obliged himself to grant such Prayers by many express Promises. Now it is a known Rule, \* *that in doubtful Cases we are to take the safest Side,*

R 2

that

---

\* *In dubiis pars tutior eligenda.*

that which is liable to the least Doubts : Much less then will a wise Man deliberate in his Choice, where one Side hath no Doubt at all, the other many. So if the Church of *Rome* could excuse herself from *Sacrilege*, in robbing the Laity of one Half of the Communion, (which she will never be able to do) yet every one sees that a *whole* Communion is better than a half one, a *more perfect* Sacrament better than a *less perfect one* ; such as a Communion only in one Kind is by the more learned Papists confessed to be. And, lastly, it is most evident, that it is much better  
to



to \* pray unto God with the Understanding than without it. Your Ladyship's Wisdom will easily direct you to carry on the Comparison by the same Method, in most of the other Points controverted between us and the Church of Rome. But I have chosen to instance in these, as being some of the most principal.

§. 18. His Offer to read any Book on our Side, that your Ladyship shall recommend to him, *and with all Diligence and Indifference to peruse it*, is again very fair and ingenuous. In the Abundance of ex-

---

\* Cajetan in 1 Cor. 14. *Ex hac Pauli doctrinā habetur, quod melius ad edificationem Ecclesiæ est Orationes publicas quæ, audiente Populo, dicuntur, dici lingua communi Clericis & Populo, quam dici Latine.*

cellent Books of this Kind, it is hard to make a Choice. How many full and clear Discourses have been long since written against the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, as to the Points in Controversy between them and us, that are yet unanswered, and are like so to remain for ever? But if a new Treatise may be judged best, I humbly advise your Ladyship to recommend to his Reading a Book of the learned Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, lately published, and entituled, *A Discourse concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, &c.* and to hear what he can return in Answer to it.

§. 18. And now we come to his great Boast; so great a one, that I wonder it should drop from the Pen of any well advised Person, that considers what he saith or writes: *And this, Madam, give me Leave to recommend to your Reflections as most undeniable, That all Christianity over the whole World, was first planted by the Missionaries and Apostles sent by and from the Heads of our Church under Jesus Christ, by the immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost, &c. &c. O the hard Forehead of a Roman Catholick!*

This that he recommends to your Ladyship as an *undeniable Truth*, is, indeed, (saving his honourable Re-  
lation

lation to your Ladyship's Blood) *a most gross Falshood.* It is so far from being true, that all Christianity was first planted in the World by the Missionaries of the Church of *Rome*, that 'tis manifest that Christianity was planted in the Eastern Parts of the World, and divers eminent Churches of Christ formed and settled there, before the Church of *Rome* had a Being, and whilst the *Tarpeian* Hill was covered with a thick Fog of *Paganism.* Christianity was first planted (as every Man knows, that hath read the Scriptures) in *Jerusalem*, where was a numerous Church settled, and *St. James*, the Brother of  
our



our Lord, by the Hands of the Apostles, (and as many of the Antients tell us, by the immediate Order of Christ himself) constituted Bishop. This was the First and Truly Mother-Church. From this *Seminary* of Christianity many other Churches were planted in *Judea*, *Acts* 9. 8. in *Samaria*, *Acts* 8. 5, 6, 14, 15. in *Syria*, and in particular in that noble City thereof *Antioch*, where the Disciples were first called Christians, *Acts* 11. 26. And 'tis observable, that all this while the Apostles preached the Gospel to none but those of the *Jewish* Nation or Religion, *Acts* 11. v. 29. All this while the City of

S Rome

*Rome* lay in Darknefs: 'Till at length, in the Reign of *Claudius*, as \* *Eusebius* relates it, *St. Peter* came to *Rome*, (and certainly then he came, if ever) and brought the Light of the heavenly Doctrine from the East into the Western Parts of the World. If the Author of the *Letter* shall object, That all these Plantations in the East were made by *St. Peter*, who was afterwards Head of the Church of *Rome*, the Answer is easy. 1. This Plea is impertinent, (how true soever it may be allowed to be) seeing it still appears that these Things were not done by *St. Peter*, as the Head of the Church of *Rome*; for this he

---

\* *Histor. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 14. Grac.*

could not be before that Church was in Being. 2. *St. Paul* also planted some Churches in the Eastern Parts of the World, before the Gospel was preached in the City of *Rome*. As soon as he was converted, which was in the Reign of *Tiberius*, and in the nineteenth Year thereof, as *Eusebius* tells us in his *Chronicle*, he went into *Arabia*, and preached the Gospel there; and this, as the Learned have observed, was the first Plantation among the *Gentiles* made by *St. Paul*, *Galatians* 1. 17. Afterwards (as he himself tells us) he preached the Gospel from *Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum*, *Rom.* 15. 19. and that so,

as that he strove to preach it *where Christ was not yet named*, nor the Foundations of Christianity already laid by others, *ver. 20, 21.* And indeed St. Paul planted more Churches in the Eastern and Western Parts of the World, than St. Peter, or any other of the Apostles *besides*, yea, it seems more than all the rest of the *Apostles together*; for he *laboured more abundantly than them all*, 1 Cor. 15. 10. Hence \*St. Clement, Bishop of Rome in the Apostolick Age, speaking of the Labours of St. Peter and St. Paul, briefly touches on the former, but dwells in the Praises of the latter, (not so much as mentioning St. Pe-

---

\* *Epist. ad Corinth. p. 14. Edit. Oxon. 1669.*



ter's coming to Rome.) St. Paul  
 (saith he) *having been seven times  
 cast into Bonds, scourged and stoned,  
 obtained the Reward of his Patience,  
 and having preached the Gospel in  
 the East and the West, became famous  
 for his Faith, instructing the World in  
 Righteousness; and coming into the  
 Bounds of the West, suffered Martyr-  
 dom under the Emperors, and so de-  
 parted this Life, and went into the  
 Holy Place, being made an Example  
 of the highest Patience.* Much Use  
 may be made of this Testimony by  
 the Wise and Learned: But my  
 present Purpose in alledging these  
 Words of St. Clement, (a Contem-  
 porary and Fellow-Labourer of St.  
 Paul,

*Paul*, to whom he had a nearer Relation than to *St. Peter*) is to verify *St. Paul's* Words, that he was more abundant in his Endeavours of propagating the Gospel than any other of the Apostles, *St. Peter* himself not excepted. Let me now seriously and in good Earnest ask the Author of the *Letter*, Doth he think that *St. Paul* planted all these Churches as the Missionary of *St. Peter*, (the vainly supposed Head of the Church of *Rome*) or by Authority derived from him? If he be so confident or ignorant as to affirm this, *St. Paul* himself shall refute him, who solemnly declares, that he received not his Commission from any Man  
on

on Earth, but immediately from Christ himself, *Galat. 1. 11.* that as soon as he was converted by the heavenly Vision, he betook himself to his Work of preaching the Gospel, as not conceiving it necessary to go up to *Jerusalem*, to take a Commission from *St. Peter*, or any other of the Apostles residing there, whose Faces he saw not 'till three Years after, *v. 15, 16, 17, 18.* That *St. James*, *St. Peter*, and *St. John*, the three Pillars of the Church at *Jerusalem*, upon Conference added nothing unto him, *viz.* either of *Instruction* or *Commission*, either of *Knowledge* or *Authority*, *Galat. 2. 6.* That when these three Apostles saw  
the

the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed unto him, as the Gospel of the Circumcision was unto Peter, they gave him the Right Hand of Fellowship, vers. 7, 8, 9. What can be more plain than these Words? For, according to the Suppositions of the Romanists, it should have been said, that the Headship of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, Part of the Government whereof, viz. That which concerned the Circumcision of the Jewish Church, he kept to himself, and committed the other, that respected the Gentile Christians, to St. Paul. But the Words are quite otherwise: St. Peter had his Share of Inspection  
into



into the Churehes committed to him, and St. *Paul* his, and neither of them from the other, but both from *Christ*. And here, by the Way, your Ladyship may please to observe how this very Thing, 'That the Care of the Circumcision was committed by *Christ* unto St. *Peter*, as his proper Charge, doth, if well considered, utterly overthrow the Pretences of the Church of *Rome* to the Universal Pastorship, deriv'd from St. *Peter*. For, 1. The Title of the *Apostle of the Circumcision*, given to St. *Peter* in Scripture, would have been a great Diminution to his Dignity, if (as the *Romanists* fancy) he had been Head and

T

Go.

Governour (in an appropriated Sense, not common to him with the other Apostles) both of the Circumcision and Uncircumcision, that is, of the Universal Church.

2. *St. Peter's* proper Relation to the Circumcision or Churches of the Believing *Jews*, doth not at all correspond with his taking the Charge of the Church of *Rome* (a *Gentile* Church) above all others, and residing there, and making that the chief Episcopal See. He might, indeed, occasionally come to *Rome*; and I am willing to believe (upon the Testimony of many of the Antients) that he did so, and preached there, especially to those of the  
 Cir-

Circumcision: Although some very learned Men have observed, that the whole Tradition of *St. Peter's* Voyage to *Rome*, was first derived from *Papias*, an Author indeed very ancient, but also very credulous and of a mean Judgment, (as *Eusebius* characterizes him) but that he fixed his Chair at *Rome*, among the *Gentile* Christians, and much more that he advanced that Church to the Primary and Universal Pastorship over all the rest, (supposing it in his Power so to do) is certainly a very idle and groundless Imagination, and no Way consistent with that Account of *St. Peter* which the Scripture gives us. For the Churches

of the Circumcision were his chief-  
est and proper Charge; and all his  
other Labours, in Comparison of  
what he bestowed on them, were,  
if I might so speak, a Kind of  
Πα'εργον, or *Work by the by*. And  
therefore, if any Church could  
have challenged a Primacy of Au-  
thority over the rest upon the Ac-  
count of St. Peter, it would have  
been one of the Churches of the  
Circumcision, as *Jerusalem, Anti-*  
*och,* ~~and~~ to whom he had, above all  
other Churches, a peculiar Relation,  
as being Apostle of the *Circumcision*.

---

|| Quod dicit Paulus Petro creditum fuisse Apo-  
stolatum Circumcisionis, id intelligendum est,  
ἐπὶ τὸ πάλιν. Nam & Petrus Cornelium convertit  
incircumcisum, & Paulus Judæos nonnullos. Sed  
præcipuum studium Petro erat circa Judæos, Paulo  
circa gentes alias. Grot. ad Gal. 5. 2, 7, 9.



But this I mention only by the Way, although it be very much to the Purpose: My Business was to prove (and I have done it abundantly) that St. Paul, by whom most of the first Plantations of Christianity in the World were made, was no *Missionary* of the Church of Rome, or of St. Peter, considered as Head thereof, or in any other Relation; and, consequently, that what the Author of the Letter recommends to your Ladyship's Reflection as undeniable, is a palpable Untruth, viz. *That all Christianity over the whole World was first planted by Missionaries and Apostles sent by and from the Heads of the Roman Church.*

§. 19. Some perhaps will wonder what Necessity should drive the Author of the *Letter* to maintain so extravagant an Assertion: But I acknowledge he had very great and cogent Reasons to force him on this desperate Attempt. For it is an Article of the *Romanists* Faith, that the Church of *Rome* is now and ever was from the Beginning, the Head of the Catholick Church, from which all other Churches derive their very Being of Churches. That the Church of *Rome* is *Causally* (as \* Cardinal *Perron* expresseth it) the only Catholick Church, as the Center and Beginning of Ecclesiastical Communion, infusing Unity, which is the

---

\* Reply to King James, B. 4. Ch. 9.

*Form of Universality, into the Catholick Church,* Now this cannot possibly be defended, unless you suppose the Church of *Rome* to be the *Mother Church*, and all other Churches to derive their Christianity and the Succession of their Pastors from her, But this Foundation I have already utterly destroyed, and, consequently, the towering *Babel* Superstructure raised thereon falls to the Ground. If no Church be a Catholick Church, but by its Dependence on or Derivation from the Church of *Rome*, then the first and most noble Plantations of Christianity in the East, were no true and Catholick Churches; because  
they

they were made such Churches as they were, before the Church of *Rome* had a Being: And if it be answered, That the Church of *Rome* had then a Being in her *Head*, viz, *St. Peter*, by *whom*, or by whose Authority, those Plantations in the East were made, I have already replied, 1. That *St. Peter* could not be considered as *actually* the Head of the Church of *Rome* before that Church existed. 2. That *St. Peter* was never at all the Head of the Church of *Rome*, any more than, no nor so much as he was the Head of some other Churches, as of *Jerusalem*, &c. to which he had a most especial relation, as the

*Apostle*



*Apostle of the Circumcision.* 3. That St. Paul planted most Churches both in the *East* and *West*, who yet was no dependant in the least upon St. Peter, either as the Head of the Church of *Rome*, or in any other Relation: And yet the Churches planted by St. Paul were as truly Catholick and Apostolick Churches as any planted by St. Peter. All these Things are plain and evident, and who-soever doth not wilfully shut his Eyes gainst the clear Light of the Holy Scriptures and right Reason, cannot but acknowledge them; and, being acknowledged, they do for ever destroy the senseless and arrogant Pretences of the *Romanists* to a Prima-

cy of Authority and Jurisdiction belonging to their Church, over all other Churches in the World.

§. 20. Nay, from the Grounds laid, it is manifest that the Church upon the Hill (as high as she is) cannot lay just Claim so much as to a *Prerogative of Honour*, (which yet we willingly grant to some Churches before others) above all the rest, as *Originally* due unto her. For, doubtless, this *Prerogative of Honour* was *originally* due to the *Mother* or *Original* Church: Such the Church of *Rome* was not, but indeed one of the *younger Daughters of Sion*. The Christian Church, planted at *Jerusalem*, was really  
and

and truly the *Seminary* of all Christianity over the whole World. And upon this Account the Prerogative of Honour was originally due to her : And not upon this Account alone : For, 1<sup>st</sup>, this Church was the more constant Seat and Residence of the Apostles, wherein they had their Councils, from whence they gave forth their Laws and Decrees to the other Churches, and to which the other Churches upon emergent Difficulties had Recourse, *Acts* 15. 1, 2, 6, 7, &c. 2. The Episcopal See of this Church was constituted with such Circumstances, as agree to no other Church of the Christian World besides. St.

*James*, the Brother of our Lord *Jesus*, (a Person by that Relation the most honourable) was made the first Bishop there, and in the *whole Christian World*, and that by an *Assembly of the holy Apostles*, under whose *Eyes*, and in the Place of their *Residence*, he was to execute his Office, and that again, (if we will give Credit to the united \* Testimonies of divers very ancient Christian Writers) by the express Order and Command of Christ himself. Upon which Accounts *Eusebius* tells us, that a strange Kind of Veneration was given to the very Throne and Episcopal Chair of St.

---

\* *Vide* *Henr. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. 7. c. 19.

*Vide* *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* l. 7. cap. 18. Coll. c. 19.



*James*, kept at *Jerusalem*, even to his Days, by certain superstitious Christians, who, if they had dreamt of an Infallible Chair left by *St. Peter* at *Rome*, would doubtless have paid their Homage there. 3.

'Tis certain that a Kind of Preeminence or Precedence is every where in Scripture given to the *Jews* (by reason of the Covenant of God to their Fathers, before the *Gentiles* in the Kingdom of the *Messias*, and in the Participation of those Benefits that accrue to Mankind by *Christ Jesus* and his Gospel, of which altho' the *Gentiles* were no less Partakers than the *Jews*, yet in this Order, that they were dispensed to the  
*Jew*

*Jew first, and then to the Gentile,*  
 Rom. 2. 10. and c. 3. v. 1, 2. and  
 St. Paul tells us, that it was necessa-  
 ry that the Gospel should be *first*  
 preached unto them, *Acts* 13. 46.  
 The Church of the *Jews* was then  
 the *elder Sister*, and this Right of  
*Primogeniture* she lost not by beco-  
 ming *Christian*, which she must have  
 done if we suppose her to have been  
 subjected to the Church of *Rome*, or  
 any other Church among the *Gen-  
 tiles*. Now *Jerusalem* was the  
 chief Church of the *Circumcision*,  
 and therefore, as such, the Pre-  
 eminence was due to her. And  
 accordingly we find, that although  
 this first and famous Church of  
*Je-*

*Jerusalem*, not very long after the Apostles, lost much of her *real Dignity*, not retaining so much as the Jurisdiction of the Churches of *Palestine*, (whether this happened through the several Devastations of that City, whereby it was rendered poor and contemptible; or through the inveterate Hatred of the *Gentile* Christians against the *Jewish* Believers, whereby the former sought by all Means and Arts to depress the latter; or through the political Distribution and Subordination of Churches, which was moulded according to the Civil Disposition of the *Roman* Empire, wherein *Jerusalem* happened to have

none

none of the best Shares, I determine not, although I incline to the last Resolution) yet still all other Churches for a long Time acknowledged (in Words at least) a special Respect and Honour due to that See; and some of the Antients have termed it the *Mother of all other Churches*, even the *Throne of Christ upon Earth*, and the Governors thereof the *Princes* of all other Christians in the World; and which is more, in Differences about Rights and Customs, have appealed from other Churches, even the *Roman Church* it self, to the primitive Orders and Constitutions settled in that *first Apostolical Church*,

all



all which I could make evident by many exprefs Testimonies, if I durst be fo far troublesome to your Ladyship.

§. 21, But to conclude this Discourse, we may, in Confidence of the Premises, very justly and aptly bespeak the arrogant *Romanists*, that expect all other Churches should own a Dependance upon theirs, and claim to themselves a Privilege of giving Laws to the Christian World, in the Words of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, (a learned, wealthy, and populous City, and thereby much disposed to the Humour of the Church of *Rome*, as it is at this Day) 1 Cor. 14. 36. *What? came*

*the Word of God out from you, or came it unto you only? \** The Corinthian Doctors (it seems) had introduced divers Customs contrary to the Institutions of other Churches, such as *Mens covering their Heads, and Womens being uncovered, in religious Exercises and Assemblies, Women preaching, &c.* 1 Cor. 11. 3, 4, 5, 6. and Chap. 14. ver. 34. In these evil Customs they persisted, not regarding the Pattern of other Churches, that were before them: Infomuch as the mild Apostle is forced to charge them with the Guilt of a contentious, perverse, and proud Humour, in slighting the Customs of the Catholick

---

\* *Vide Grotium in locum.*

Church, 1 Cor. 11. 16. To these he thus speaks, *What? came the Word out from you? Are you the Mother-Church? Did all the rest of the Christian World receive the Gospel and its Institutions from you? No. The Christian Law came out of Sion, and the Gospel was first preached, and the Church of Christ planted in Jerusalem: Look thither, and you shall find no such Customs used, as you obstinately persist in. Or did the Word of God come only to you? No. As you were not the first, so you are not the only Persons that received the Gospel and became a Christian Church; there are many other*

Churches besides, enjoying equal Privileges with your selves. Why are you then so arrogant? Your Ladyship's Wisdom can easily apply this, and discern how much more deeply the present Church of *Rome* is concerned in this smart Expostulation of the Apostle. And now I leave it to your Ladyship to judge what Advantage the Author of the *Letter* hath gotten to his Cause by his inconsiderate Boasts.

§. 22. As for the modern Plantations of Christianity, especially those made since the Difference between us

---

† Concerning the admirable Method used by the Ministers of the Church of *Rome* in the Conversion of the Heathens in *China* and other Neighbour Nations, your Ladyship may please to read Dr. *Stillingfleet's* late Treatise, pag. 439, 440, 441.



and the Church of *Rome*, it is not worth our while to speak of them. The Church of *Rome*, as well as other Parts of Christendom, may for Shame be silent in this Matter. Nay, sure I am, the Church of *Rome*, in the Posture it hath been for these many Years, hath so little Reason to boast of her advancing and promoting the Interest of the Christian Religion in the World, that 'tis apparent the gross Corruptions of Catholick Doctrine, defended by her, have stained and darkened (nothing more) the Glory of Christianity, and sullied its beautiful Face, and hindred its Growth and Progress. Let indifferent Persons,

sons, that have travelled abroad in the World, judge here, and they will tell us, that nothing doth more alienate the Hearts of the *Jews* and *Mahometans* too from Christianity, than the Image-Worship and Bread-Worship (so directly contrary to both their Laws) which they see with their Eyes practised by them that call themselves ~~to be~~ the only true Christians. And how many Doctrines are there defended by the Church of *Rome*, which lie as Stumbling-blocks before them? What a Mountain in their Way is the Article of *Transubstantiation*, which a Man cannot receive, without utterly renouncing at once his Reason

Reason and all his Senses too? Every Man hath heard of one great \* Person, (and we have Reason to believe that there have been many more of his Mind) that was turned off from Christianity by this just Prejudice; *If the Christians worship the God which they eat, let my Soul be with the Philosophers.* I have here a very copious and profitable Theme before me, if I had Time and Room enough to enlarge upon it: But enough of this for the present.

§. 23: We proceed, in the next Place, to the constant Visibility and Succession of Pastors in our Church,

---

\* Averroes. *Si Christiani adorant Deum quem comedunt, sit Anima mea cum Philosophis.*

which he challengeth your Ladyship, as obliged by Promise, to make good. And here I make him this fair Proposal: Let him, or any one of his Party, produce any one solid Argument to demonstrate such a Succession of Pastors in the Church of *Rome*, and I will undertake, by the very same Argument, to prove a like Succession in our Church. Indeed, your Ladyship will easily discern, that the Author of the *Letter* is concerned no less than we are, to acknowledge such a Succession of lawful Pastors in our Church, till the Time of the *Reformation*; and if we cannot derive our Succession since, 'tis a hard Case. But our  
Records



Records, faithfully kept and preserved, do evidence to all the World an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in our Church, canonically ordained, derived from such Persons in whom a lawful Power of Ordination was seated by the Confession of the Papists themselves. For the Story of the *Nagg's Head Ordination* is so putid a Fable, so often and so clearly refuted by the Writers of our Church, that the more learned and ingenuous Papists are now ashamed to make Use of it.

§. 24. His Demand, that we should shew a Succession of Pastors in our Church, in all Ages, holding  
Y ing

ing and professing the Thirty Nine Articles, is infinitely ridiculous, absurd, and unreasonable : For we ourselves acknowledge, that the Pastors of our Church were, before the *Reformation*, involved, as well as others, in the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, against which our Thirty Nine Articles are mainly directed ; or else there had been no Need of *Reformation*. And let him, if he can, shew a constant Succession of Pastors in the Church of *Rome*, always professing the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*, in the Points of *Image-Worship*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Communion in one Kind*, *Purgatory*,  
*Indul-*

*Indulgencies, &c.* and I will promise with Heart and Hand to subscribe to that Council. But 'tis as clear as the Light at Noon-Day, that the Decrees of that Council in those Articles are most contrary to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church (and so of the Pastors of the Church of *Rome*) in the first and best Ages. As for our selves, that which we maintain is this, That our Church and the Pastors thereof did always acknowledge the same Rule of Faith, the same fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion, both before and since the *Reformation*: But with this Difference, that we then professed the Rule of Faith

together with the additional Corruptions of the Church of *Rome* ; but now (God be thanked) without them. So that the Change, as to Matter of Doctrine, which hath been in our Church and her Pastors, is for the better ; like that of a Man from being leprous becoming sound and healthy, and yet always the same Man. This a learned \* Prelate of our Church solemnly proclaimed to all the World in these Words : *Be it known to all the World, that our Church is only reformed or repaired, not made new ; there is not one Stone of a new Foundation laid by us ; yea, the old Walls stand still, only the Overcasting of*

---

\* Bishop Hall's Old Religion, Chap. 3.



those ancient Stones with the untempered Mortar of new Inventions displeaseth us: Plainly; set aside the Corruptions, and the Church is the same. And what are these Corruptions, but unsound Adjections to the ancient Structure of Religion? These we cannot but oppose, and therefore are unjustly and imperiously asserted. Hence it is that ours is by the Opposite styled an ABLATIVE or NEGATIVE RELIGION; for so much as we join with all true Christians in all affirmative Positions of ancient Faith, only standing upon the Denial of some late and undue Additions to the Christian Belief. Let the Author of the Letter prove, that

that our Church, since the *Reformation*, hath departed from any one Article of the Common Faith, always received in the Church of God, and more fully explained in the Creeds of the first General Councils, and he will perform something to the Purpose; but till then all his Discourses of our Change in Point of Doctrine will be impertinent. And that he will never be able to prove this, will appear afterwards.

§. 25. Indeed, the Question is here the same with that threadbare one which the Papists use to reiterate, when they have nothing else to say for themselves, *Where was*

*was your Church before* LUTHER?  
 To which the Answer is easy: Our  
 Church was then where it is now,  
 even here in ENGLAND. She  
 hath not changed one Thing of  
 what she held before, any Way  
 pertaining either to the Being or  
 Well-being of a Church; only she  
 hath made an Alteration in some  
 Things, which seemed to her (and  
 so they will to all indifferent Judges)  
 greatly prejudicial to both. She  
 still retains the same common Rule  
 of Faith. She still teacheth the Ne-  
 cessity of a holy Life, and presseth  
 good Works as much as before; on-  
 ly she is grown more humble, and  
 dares not ascribe any Merit to them.  
 She

She still observes all the fundamental Ordinances and Institutions of Christianity. \* She baptizeth, she feeds with the Holy Eucharist, she confirmeth. She retaineth the same *Apostolical* Government of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. And because she finds that a Set Form of *Liturgy* is used by all Christian Churches in the World, without any known Beginning, she hath hers too, and that a grave, solemn, excellently-composed one, conformed, as near as she could devise, to the Pattern of the most ancient Offices. A *Liturgy*, for its Innocence and Purity, so beyond all just Exceptions, that

---

\* *Aqua signat, S. Spiritu vestit, Eucharistia pascit. Ita de Ecclesia Romana. Tertull. de Præscript. adversus Hæret. Cap. 36.*



the Papiſts themſelves, upon its firſt Eſtabliſhment, could not but embrace it. And therefore for ſeveral Years they came to our Churches, joined in our Devotions, and communicated without Scruple, till at laſt (as an excellent Perſon of our Church rightly expreſſeth it) *a Temporal Interſt of the Church of Rome rent the Schiſm wider, and made it gape like the Jaws of the Grave*: Nay, it is tranſmitted to us (as the ſame excellent Author obſerves) by the Teſtimony of Perſons greater than all Exception, that *Paulus Quartus*, Pope of Rome, in his private Intercourſes and Letters to Queen *Elizabeth*, did offer to

confirm and establish the *Common-Prayer-Book*, if she would acknowledge the Primacy and Authority, and the Reformation derivative from him. \* And this Method was pursued by his Successor *Pius Quartus*, who assured her, she should have any Thing from him, not only Things pertaining to her Soul, but what might conduce to the Establishment and Confirmation of her Royal Dignity ; amongst which, That the *Liturgy* newly established by her Authority, should not be rescinded by the Pope's Power, was not the least considerable. I beseech your Ladyship to make a little

---

\* *Camden's Annals*, A. D. 1560.

*Baker's Chron. Eliz. Anno 1560. p. 343.*

Pause here. Our Liturgy contains the whole Religion of the Church of *England*. This the Popes and Bishops of *Rome* themselves offer to confirm and establish. Let me now ask this Question, Is our Liturgy in it self a good and safe Way of Worshipping God, or not? If not, these Popes were to blame in offering to confirm it; for no subsequent Decree of a Pope could make that safe and good, which was not so antecedently. If it were, in it self, good and safe, then it is so still, though the Pope of *Rome* never confirmed it; and so the whole Religion and Reformation of the Church of *England* is safe and

good, by the plain Confession of the Pope himself, the infallible Judge of the *Roman* Church. But let us proceed. As to the Catholick Customs, our Church (so far is she from the Love of Innovation) professeth all Reverence and Respect unto them. Upon this Score, she still observes all the great and ancient Festivals of the Church with great Solemnity, viz. the Feasts of the *Nativity*, *Circumcision*, *Passion*, *Resurrection*, and *Ascension* of our Saviour, the *Descent* of the Holy Ghost, or the Feast of *Pentecost*, &c. She still honours the Memory of the holy Apostles, Saints, and Martyrs, and hath Days wherein to express



press this, and to bless God for them, and propound their Vertues to the Imitation of her Sons. The ancient Fasts of the Church she hath not rejected; and therefore, because she finds a *Lent*, or solemn Fast, before the great Festival of *Easter*, presently after the Apostles universally observed (though with a considerable \* Variety, as to the Number of Days, and the Hours of Abstinence on those Days) in the Church of God, she recommends the same Observation to her Sons, in the full Number of Forty Days, to be kept as Days of stricter Temperance, and Prayer too, by all those whose

---

\* *Vide Iren. Epist. ad Victorem, apud Eusebium Hist. Eccl. l. 25. cap. 24. & Valefii Annot. in locum.*

Health and other Circumstances will permit them to undertake it. She still observes the Fasts of the four Seasons, or \* *Ember Weeks*. She still recommends the two Weekly *Stations* of the Primitive Church to the Observation of her Sons, † *Wednesday* and *Fryday*, distinguishing them from other Days of the Week by the more solemn and *penitential* Office of the *Litany*. And in the Table of the Fasts to be observed, all *Fridays* in the Year, except *Christmas-Day*, are expressly mentioned. I might proceed to other

---

\* Concerning their Antiquity in *England*, see *Spelman Conc. Brit.* p. 256, & 518, & 546. And concerning the Continuance of them in our Church, see *Can. 31. An. Dom. 1603.*

† *Quarta & sexta Feria, vide Grot. Annot. ad Luc. 18. 12.*

Instances ; but these are abundantly sufficient to shew, that the Church of *England* in her Reformation affected no unnecessary Change or Innovation. Indeed, she made no Change or Innovation, but of those Things that were themselves manifest Changes and Innovations, yea, somewhat worse ; such as those abovementioned, *Image-Worship, the Worship and Invocation of Saints and Angels, the Dry Communion, the senseless and unreasonable Service of God in an unknown Tongue, enjoined the People and not understood by them.* Wherein, as I have already shewn, every Man's Reason and Conscience will tell him, that the Change is  
made

made for the better. She hath also shaken off (and it was high Time so to do, seeing that St. *Augustin* so long ago complained of it) that intolerable Yoke of Ceremonies, many of which were perfectly *insignificant* and *ridiculous*, some directly *sinful*, and their Number in the whole so *great*, as to require that *Intention* of Mind, which ought to be employed about more *weighty* and *important* Matters, yet retaining still (to shew that she was not over nice and scrupulous) some few Ceremonies, that had on them the Stamp of venerable Antiquity, or otherwise recommended themselves by their Decency and Fitness.

In



In a Word, the Authors of our Reformation dealt with our *Church* as they did with our *Temples*, or *material Churches*. They did not pull them down, and raise new Structures in their Places, no, nor so much as new consecrate the old ones ; but only removed the Objects and Occasions of Idolatrous Worship, (at least out of the more open and conspicuous Places) and took away some little superstitious Trinkets, in other Things leaving them as they found them, and freely and without Scruple making Use of them.

§. 26. What next he saith concerning our notorious Prevarication

A a

from

from the Articles of our Church I do not perfectly understand. He very well knows, that all our Clergy doth still subscribe them: And if any Man hath dared openly to oppose the declared Sense of the Church of *England* in any one of those Articles, he is liable to Ecclesiastical Censure, which would be more duly passed and executed, did not the Divisions and Fanatick Disturbances, first raised and still fomented by the blessed Emissaries of the Apostolick See, hinder and blunt the Edge of our Discipline. But possibly he intends that *Latitude of Sense*, which our Church, as an indulgent Mother, allows her Sons

in

in some abstruser Points, (such as Predestination, &c.) not particularly and precisely defined in her Articles, but in general Words capable of an indifferent Construction. If this be his Meaning, this is so far from being a Fault, that 'tis the singular Praise and Commendation of our Church. As for our being concluded by the Articles of our Church, if he means our being obliged to give our internal Assent to every Thing delivered in them upon Peril of Damnation, 'tis confessed that few, yea, none of us, that are well-advised, will acknowledge our selves so *concluded* by them, nor did our Church ever

intend we should. For she professeth not to deliver all her Articles (all I say, for some of them are coincident with the fundamental Points of Christianity) as *Essentials of Faith*, without the Belief whereof no Man can be saved; but only propounds them as a *Body of safe and pious Principles*, for the Preservation of Peace to be subscribed, and not openly contradicted by her Sons. And therefore she requires Subscription to them only from the *Clergy*, and not from the *Laity*, who yet are obliged to acknowledge and profess all the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, no less than the most learned Doctors.

This



This hath been often told the Papists by many learned Writers of our Church. I shall content my self (at present) only with two illustrious Testimonies of two famous Prelates. The late Terror of the Romanists, Dr. Usher, the most learned and Reverend Primate of Ireland, thus expresseth the Sense of the Church of England, as to the Subscription required to the Thirty Nine Articles, *\* We do not suffer any Man to reject the 39 Articles of the Church of England at his Pleasure, yet neither do we look upon them as Essentials of Saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ and his Apostles; but in a Mean, as pious Opinions, fitted for*

---

*\* Schism guarded, p. 150. See also p. 396.*

*the Preservation of Peace and Unity ; neither do we oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* So the excellent Bishop Hall, in his *Catholick Propositions*, (truly so called) denyeth, in general, that any Church can lawfully propose any Articles to her Sons, besides those contained in the common Rule of Faith, to be believed under Pain of Damnation. His third Proposition is this : \* *The Sum of the Christian Faith, are those Principles of the Christian Religion, and fundamental Grounds and Points of Faith, which are undoubtedly contained and laid down in the Canonical Scriptures, whether in express Terms or by neces-*

---

\* *Second Tome, p. 184.*

*sary Consequence ; and in the ancient Creeds universally received, and allowed by the Church of God.*

*And then in the 7th and 8th Propositions, he speaks fully to our Purpose, Prop. 7. There are and may be many Theological Points, which are wont to be believed and maintained, and so may lawfully be of this or that particular Church, or the Doctors thereof, or their Followers, as godly Doctrines and profitable Truths, besides those other essential and main Matters of Faith, without any Prejudice at all of the common Peace of the Church. Propos. 8. Howsoever it may be lawful for learned Men and particular Churches to believe and*  
*main-*

*maintain those probable (or as they may think) certain Points of Theological Verity, yet it is not lawful for them to impose and obtrude the same Doctrines upon any Church or Person, to be believed and held, as upon the Necessity of Salvation ; or to Anathemize or eject out of the Church any Person or Company of Men that thinks otherwise.*

As for the fundamental Principles of the Christian Religion, undoubtedly delivered in the Scriptures, and allowed (except the *Romanists*, who have so affected Singularity, as to frame to themselves a new Christianity) by the whole Church of God, they are by the  
Con-



Consent of all Christians acknowledged to be contained in that called the *Creed*, or *Rule of Faith*.

§. 27. This Rule of Faith, and that also as it is more fully explained by the first general Councils, our Church heartily embraceth and hath made a Part of her Liturgy, and so hath obliged all her Sons to make solemn Profession thereof. To declare this more distinctly to your Ladyship, our Church receiveth that which is called the Apostles Creed, and enjoins the publick Profession thereof to all her Sons in her *Daily Service*. And if this Creed be not thought express enough fully to declare the Sense  
 B b of

of the Catholick Church in Points of necessary Belief, and to obviate the perverse Interpretations of Hereticks, she receiveth also that admirable Summary of the Christian Faith, which is called the *Nicene Creed*, (but is indeed the entire ancient Creed of the Oriental Churches, together with the necessary additional Explications thereof, made by Fathers both of the Council of *Nice* against *Arius*, and the Council of *Constantinople* against *Macedonius*.) the publick Profession whereof she also enjoins all her Sons (without any Exception) to make in the Morning Service of every Sunday and Holiday. This Creed she professeth (consentaneously to her

own Principles) to receive upon this Ground primarily, because she finds that the Articles thereof may be proved by most evident Testimonies of Scripture. Although she deny not, that she is confirmed in her Belief of this *Creed*; because she finds all the Articles thereof, in all Ages, received by the Catholick Church. Some, indeed, have questioned [yea, denyed this] concerning the additional Explications of the Fathers of *Nice* and *Constantinople*. As though all the Fathers of the first Three Hundred Years, had understood the respective Articles to which those Explications belong, in a Sense quite different

from, yea, contrary to the Sense which those Councils had offered to them. But this Suggestion is so manifest a Falshood, that I wonder much to find it with so great a Confidence delivered in the Writings of divers learned Men. The Sum of what the *Nicene* Fathers have added by Way of Explication to the Rule of Faith, is this: That the Son of God *is no Creature, but very God, subsisting in the very Substance, Essence, and Nature of his Father.* Now although many of those ancient Writers have let fall such Things (especially in the Heat of Contest) as seem not very consistent with the Consubstantiality of the

the



the Son with the Father, yet the Thing it self is professedly and frequently acknowledged by all, not one excepted ; as I could make appear by many full and exprefs Testimonies out of each of them. Indeed, not one of them (no not *Origen* himself, charged by so many with Heresy in this Article) ever dreamt the Son of God (in that Nature wherein he is more properly so called) to be a Creature. \* Nay, *Tertullian* (who flourished about 130 Years before the *Nicene* Council, and hath as many unwary Ex-

---

\* *Οὐκ ὁμοίας Sacramentum quæ Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit tres dirigens Patrem, Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum ; tres autem non Statu sed Gradu ; nec Substantia, sed Forma ; nec Potestate, sed Specie : Unius autem Substantia, & unius Status, & unius Potestatis, quia unus Deus, &c. Tertul. advers. Prax. cap. 2.*

pressions in this Matter as any one of those Writers whatsoever, yet) delivers this as the received Doctrine of the Catholick Church in his Time ; That the Three Persons of the ever to be adored Trinity, the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are of one Substance, and one State, and one Power, because one God.* Where we have not only the full Sense, but the very Words of the *Nicene Fathers* in this Article, which is especially quarrelled at by some no less presumptuous than peevish Men. And this he delivers as a Doctrine understood to be contained in the Creed or Rule of Faith then received in the Church, and which be-  
fore

fore he had just laid down. Nay, it is apparent from the whole Tenor of *Tertullian's* Discourse in that Book, that the Heresy of *Praxeas*, asserting the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be but one Person, was built upon these two *Hypotheses*, 1<sup>st</sup>, That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were acknowledged by the Catholicks to be of one and the same Substance and Nature. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That there could not be three distinct Persons subsisting in the same divine Essence. And, indeed, the main Argument made Use of by all the several Hereticks, that from the Beginning oppugned the Deity of the Son, (as asserted by the Catholicks)

tholicks) was this, that the Doctrine was repugnant to the Unity and Simplicity of the Divine Essence; for which Argument there had not been the least Colour, if the Catholicks had only asserted the Son to be a made God, or a Creature (howsoever dignified yet) of an Essence and Nature infinitely distant and alien from the Nature and Essence of the Father. To these let me add one Argument, which seems to me irrefragable.

\* There was a famous Question much disputed in the early Days of the Church, even in the first Suc-

---

\* *Vide Justin Martyr Dial. cum Tryph. pag. 358. Col. p. 284. & Tatian. Orat. contra Gracos ad calcem Operum Justiniani, pag. 145. & Librum de recta Confessione inter Opera Justiniani, pag. 380.*



cession of the Apostles, (as it evidently appears from the Writings of *Justin Martyr*, and his Scholar *Tatian*, and others) concerning the Manner of the Son's Generation, viz. whether it were by a Kind of *Abscission* from the Essence of the Father, or by a *simple Communication* of Essence, is such as betwixt Fire producing other Fire, without any Diminution of it self and the Fire produced. Now, how impertinent, how frivolous, how even ridiculous had this Controversy been, if it had not been taken for granted on all Hands, that the Son was begotten of the very *Essence* of the Father, and not made of Things

that were not? The Sum of the explicatory Addition made by the Fathers of *Constantinople* to the Article concerning the Holy Ghost is this, *That the Holy Ghost is no created Spirit, but a Divine Person, or very God, to whom, in Conjunction with the Father and the Son, Divine Worship and Honour ought to be given.* Now we have already shewn, that the Catholick Church, even in *Tertullian's* Time, (so long before the Council of *Constantinople*) acknowledged the Holy Ghost, no less than the Son, to be of one Substance, State, and Power with the Father. \* And

---

\* *Duos Deos & duos Dominos nunquam ex ore nostro proferimus, non quasi non & Pater Deus, & Filius Deus, & Spiritus Sanctus Deus, & Deus unusquisque &c.* *Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 13. n. 73. ex Edit. Pamelii.*

the same *Tertullian* afterwards in the same Book, (delivering again the common Belief of the Catholics in his Time) tells us expressly, *that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and every one of them is God.* And how many Testimonies, out of the most ancient Fathers, might I here heap together? But it is needless; for as long as the Sacrament of Baptism, as it was appointed by Christ to be administered, *in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,* shall continue in the Church, (that is, whilst the Church shall continue) as long as the Doxology, or Glorification of the Father, Son,

and Holy Ghost together, (which was received in the Catholick Church in the very Age that trod upon the Heels of the Apostles, as appears from the Testimony of † St. *Justin Martyr* and others) shall retain a Place in the Liturgy and Publick Offices of the Church: So long shall we not want a clear Proof and a practical Evidence and Demonstration that the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and so the *Consubstantiality* of each Person in the most Blessed Trinity, is a Catholick Verity. This I thought fit to observe, to obviate the vain Plea of the *Romanists*, who from the Example of the Fathers of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, justify their

---

† *Apolog.* 2. p. 97, 98.



bold and presumptuous Additions of new Articles to the Rule of Faith, or at least of new Explications of the old Articles to such a Sense, wherein they were never before understood by the Catholick Church: For supposing the Authority of their Church equal to that of the two first General Councils, (which yet is to be granted) yet these Councils will not at all excuse them; for neither did they add any new Article to the Rule of Faith, nor a new Sense to any old Article.

§. 28. To return: This Creed (which our Church thus heartily owns, and obligeth all her Sons to profess)

profess) is a sufficient Summary of the Articles of Faith, and consequently our Church, by owning it, sufficiently declares herself to be Catholick in all Points of Faith, and distinguisheth herself from all Heretical Societies and Combinations. If not, then, 1<sup>st</sup>, The first General Councils did not sufficiently declare the Rule of Faith; for we receive all that was declared by them to be *de Fide*, or Matter of Faith. 2. Then (particularly) the Council of \* *Ephesus* (the third General Council) did err in the very Definition of the Rule of Faith, when the Fathers thereof thus expressly determined: *That it should*

---

\* *Concil. Ephes. Can. 7. apud Justell. p. 52, 60.*

not be lawful for any one to produce, write, or compose, any other Creed besides that which was agreed on and defined by the holy Fathers, who were met together at \* Nice, by the holy Spirit ; and those who should dare to compose, produce, or offer any other Creed to such as desired to return to the Knowledge of the Truth, from Paganism, Judaism, or any Heresy whatsoever, should, if Bishops, be deposed from their Episcopal Throne ; if inferiour Clergymen, deprived of Holy Orders ; if Laymen, excommu-

---

\* They mean notwithstanding the Creed established in the Council of Constantinople, as being the same, with a little Addition, with that of Nice. For it appears from the Acts of the Ephesian Council, that it was the Constantinopolitan Creed that was openly read in the Council, and that upon the Reading thereof this Decree was passed.

*nicated, or cast out of the Church.*  
 The whole Canon is remarkable  
 and very much to our Purpose; but  
 we are especially to observe those  
 Words, *or from any Heresy whatsoever.* For hereby the *Ephesian Fa-*  
*thers* declare, that if any Person  
 was charged with any Kind of  
 Heresy whatsoever, he should suffi-  
 ciently purge himself by the Ac-  
 knowledgment of the aforesaid  
 Creed; and that upon his Subscrip-  
 tion thereunto, or Profession there-  
 of, he should be *absolved*, and re-  
 ceived into the Communion of the  
 Church, as a *complete and perfect*  
*Catholick*; and that whoever should  
 propose to such a Person any Thing  
 else



else to be believed, as a necessary Condition of Ecclesiastical Communion, should himself be liable to the Censure of the Church. Now, to apply this: Our Church doth so heartily embrace the aforesaid Creed, that she hath inserted it into her Liturgy, not only to be now and then read, but on every Lord's Day, and in every more solemn Assembly to be openly professed by all her Sons: And therefore she is in all Points of Faith and necessary Belief compleatly and perfectly Catholick and Orthodox, by the Judgment of the *third* General Council; and the Papists (that in the mean time call us Hereticks, Did and

and refuse to hold Communion with us as such are themselves liable to a severe Punishment.

§. 29. And here (by the Way) 'tis worth while to observe the egregious Prevarication of the Trent Fathers, (and the Fathers indeed of that which is called the Roman Catholic Religion) in this Matter of the Creed, or Rule of Faith. † In the third Session, before they come to define any one particular Article, they declare it necessary, after the Pattern (forsooth) of the anci-

---

† Quare Symbolum fidei, quo sancta Ecclesia Romana utitur, tanquam Principium, in quo omnes qui fidem Christo profitentur necessario conveniunt, & fundamentum primum & unicum, contra quod porta Inferni nunquam praevalerunt, totidem verbis quibus in omnibus Ecclesiis legitur exprimendum esse censuit. Quod ejusmodi est, Credo in unum Deum, &c. & in Missali est. Caranz. Sum. Concil. Pag. 705. Edit. Duac. 1648.

ent Fathers and Councils, (whom they have imitated not half so well as an Ape doth a Man) to premise the Symbol, or *Rule of Faith*, used in the holy Church of Rome, (which is indeed the Creed of *Constantinople*, and beginning with these Words, *I believe in one God*, and this Creed they judge necessary to be in so many express Words professed by their whole Assembly, as the Principle wherein all Christians, that profess the Faith of Christ, do necessarily agree; and the only firm Foundation, against which the Gates of Hell shall never prevail. Where, when they profess this Creed to be the Principle, wherein all Christians do necessarily

fairly agree, they plainly intimate  
 (if we poor Protestants may pre-  
 sume to understand their Meaning  
 by their Words) that there is no  
 absolute Necessity that all Christi-  
 ans should agree in other Things.  
 But their following Words are ex-  
 press, wherein they acknowledge  
 this Creed to be the only Foundation,  
 and consequently, that nothing is  
 to be laid as a Foundation beside:  
 Nay, that this Creed is the only  
 firm Foundation, against which the  
 Gates of Hell shall never prevail. For  
 who would not here conclude that  
 (by the Confession of the Trent Fa-  
 thers themselves) whosoever fixeth  
 his Feet upon this Foundation, and  
 depart-



departeth not from any one Article contained in this Creed, stands sure, as to all Points of Faith, and is in no Danger at all of Damnation, or Hell-Fire, upon the Account of Herefy. And yet, in the following Sessions, how *prodigally* doth this Pack of bold and presumptuous Men bestow their *Anathema's*, thundering out Hell and Damnation to Millions of Pious Souls, who stand firmly upon this only firm Foundation, and cannot be proved to have denyed any one Point reducible or deducible from any Article of the Rule of Faith. Very many are the Instances that I might give your Ladyship of this; but I shall  
con-

content my self to instance only in  
such Points held and defined by  
the Council of *Trent*, which I have  
already proved to be so far from  
*Articles of Faith*, ~~and~~ that they are  
evidently *false, erroneous, and dan-*  
*gerous.* In the 13th Session, Canon  
2. they Anathematize and Damn all  
those who shall dare so far to trust  
all their Senses wherewith God  
hath blessed them, as to believe that  
the Bread and Wine in the Sacra-  
ment, do, after the Words of Con-  
secration, still remain in Substance  
the same, (though they confess  
them transcendently changed in Use)  
that is, *Bread and Wine.* And con-  
sequently, in the 6th Canon of the  
same

same Session, they Anathematize and Damn all those who shall teach, that the Consecrated Bread and Wine ought not to be worshipped with Divine Worship, (such as is due to the only begotten Son of God himself) or to be carryed about in Solemn Procession, to be so worshipped and adored by the People. A hard Case! All our Senses infallibly assure us of the Truth of the former Proposition, and upon the Supposal thereof the Papists do themselves confess the Truth of the latter, and yet, nevertheless, we must be Damn'd for thus Teaching. So in the 21st Session they are Anathematized and Damned, that  
shall

shall say, that all the Faithful are bound by the Command of God to receive the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in both Kinds. And yet we have an expresse Command of Christ concerning both, who took the Bread, and said, *Take and Eat*, and the Cup and said, *Drink ye, all of it*, *Matthew* 26. 26, 27. If the Patrons of this wicked Decree, shall say, (as they have the Impudence to say) that the latter Branch of the Precept, *Drink ye all of it*, concerns not the Laity at all, but only the Priest, such as the Apostles were, the horrid Consequence of this Answer is visible to any Man, that is not wilfully or fatally blinded,



ed, viz. that then the former Branch of the Commandment, *Take and Eat*, concerns not the *Laity* neither, but only the *Priests*, seeing both Parts of the Precept are delivered in the same Breath, to the same Persons, and in the same imperative and commanding Stile. And then we may next expect, (and by the same Reason justify) another Anathema or Curse against all those *presumptuous* Persons, that shall dare to teach, that Lay-Christians are by any Command of God bound to receive the Holy Eucharist at all, or in any Part thereof. And then at last well fare the Dregs of *Fanaticism*, the Quakers and others,

E e

thers, who have wholly laid this Sacrament aside, as unnecessary. Lastly, in the 25th or last Session, they command the Bishops, (as a Work, forsooth, worthy of their great and sacred Office) *to teach Invocation of Saints, the Honour of Reliques, the Use of Images, and that* (lest we should be ignorant of their Meaning) *such as was established by the Decrees* (especially) *of the second Nicene Synod: And to proclaim those to be of impious Opinion, that teach otherwise. And presently after they denounce an Anathema against any Man, that should teach or* (so much as) *think contrarily to those Decrees.*

And

And yet as to the Use of Images, that is, the Religious Veneration and Worship of them, such as was established by the Convention of *Nice*, it is notorious (and confessed also by a very learned \* Writer of their own) that the Decrees of that Convention, as far as concern the Worship of Images, were shortly after, in a numerous Synod of about 300 Bishops, (called therefore *the plenary Council*) out of all *Italy*, *Germany*, *France*, and *Britain*, convened upon another Occasion by *Charles the Great* at *Francfort*, after a diligent Reading of them in the

E e 2

Hear-

---

\* *Cassander Consult. de Imaginibus & Simulacris.*

*Concilium plenarium, v. Baron. Annal. ad An. Christi 794.*

Hearing of the whole Assembly, (and therefore not upon Mistake or Misrepresentation, as *Baronius* and others, without any Colour of Truth pretend) with an universal Consent condemned and utterly rejected, as *repugnant not only to the Scriptures, and the ancient Tradition of the Fathers, but also to the Custom of the Roman Church.* So that if we must be damned for opposing the Decrees of the Convention of *Nice* concerning Image-Worship, we see what Company we have, even the Bishops of all *Italy, Germany, France,* and our *Britain*, (so many Ages before the *Reformation*) involved together with our selves in the same Guile



Guilt and Danger. And if we must suffer an *Anathema* for thinking otherwise in the Point of *Invocation of Saints* than the Church of *Rome* teacheth, this is our abundant Comfort, that we are of the same Opinion in that Article with the whole Catholick Church of Christ for at least the first *three hundred Years*, (the best and purest Ages of the Church) as I have already clearly demonstrated. After the same Manner the Confession of Faith, according to the Council of *Trent*, begins likewise (for a Shew) with the *Constantinopolitan Creed*; but then presently to the wholesome Principles contained therein, are added

ded all the unsound and corrupt Doctrines of the Roman Church concerning the prodigious Riddle of Transubstantiation, the Half Communion, Purgatory, the Religious Worship and Invocation of Saints, the Worship of Images, Reliques, Indulgencies, the Primacy of the Church and Bishop of Rome over the Universal Church, yea, all the Decrees of the Holy Council of Trent, as undoubtedly to be received. Concerning this Medley of Religion, this Mixture of Gold, Silver, precious Stones, Wood, Hay, and Stubble together, \* the miserable Trent Papist is bound to profess, † *That this is*

\* 1 Cor. 3. 12.

† *Hanc veram & catholicam fidem, extra quam salvis nemo esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profitear.*

*the Catholick Faith, without which no  
 Man can be saved, and that upon  
 his Oath too ; that is, he is bound  
 to pawn his own Salvation, that all  
 the Christian Churches of the World  
 are damned, besides the Roman,*  
*that doth not dissent from some one  
 Article of this prodigious Creed :*  
*And the main Article concerning  
 the Primacy of the Bishops of Rome  
 over the Universal Church, is by  
 all of them universally disowned.*  
*Yea, there are Thousands in the  
 Communion of the Church of  
 Rome, that will not acknowledge  
 all the Decrees of the Council of  
 Trent for Divine Oracles, such as  
 this Confession of Faith declares*  
*them*

them to be. With ſo intolerable a Pride, Arrogance, and Preſumption (at which every Man that fears God, and conſiders the Thing, cannot chooſe but tremble, and be filled with Horreur and Amazement) do theſe Men domineer and lord it over the Faith and Conſcience of Chriſtendom. But, leaving the Wretches to the righteous Judgments of God, let us return thither from whence we have a little digreſſed.

§. 30. By what hath been ſaid, we have abundantly cleared ourſelves of Prevarications from the Articles of our Religion. For we have demonſtrated, I. As to the  
Thirty



Thirty Nine Articles of our Church, to be subscribed by our Clergy, it is so far from being true, (what the Author of the *Letter* suggests) that few of us will be concluded by them, that, on the contrary, we all do and must suffer our selves to be concluded by them, as far as our Church, in the Imposition of them, intended we should. II. That as for those Articles of Religion which our Church proposeth to all her Sons, (without Exception) to be professed by them as Points undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, and contained in the ancient Creeds, and acknowledged by the Catholick Church in all Ages, she hath taken

F f

Care,

Care, (as far as a Church can possibly) to prevent any the least Prevarication from them, by enjoining every one of us to make an open and solemn Profession of them (in our Service and publick Liturgy) before the Face of the Congregation, and in the Presence of Almighty God.

§. 31. Let us now briefly consider how this Charge of Prevarication, objected by the Author of the *Letter* against us, will return very heavily upon the Men of his own Church. 'Tis very manifest, that divers, living in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and professing themselves *Roman Catholicks*, have  
most

most egregiously prevaricated from the Articles of the *Roman* Faith. The Articles of the *Roman* Faith, did I say? I confess 'tis very hard, if not impossible, to define what they are, or to draw up such a Body of Articles, as shall be acknowledged for a *Standard* of the *Roman* Faith by all that profess themselves to be of that Religion. This is so true, that I do *solemnly* profess, if I had any Mind to be a *Roman Catholick*, (which, God be thanked, I have not) I could not certainly tell how to be, or when I might be assured that I am such, unless I could persuade my self to the smutty Faith of the Collier, to

believe as the Church doth, without knowing what it is that the Church believeth, or what is that Church which so believes, as I profess my self to do. But let us follow them as far as we can in their Labyrinth. There are certain Points received as Articles of Faith at *Rome*, and a Man would be *there* accounted no *Roman Catholick* that should deny them) which yet are openly denyed by some that profess themselves *Roman Catholicks*. I instance only in two, *The personal Infallibility of the Pope, and his Superiority to a General Council*. As for the first, our Countryman, Mr. *White*, (a learned *Roman Catholick*,  
and



and one who hath many Followers, and Leaders too) is so far from acknowledging the Personal Infallibility of the Pope, that he † affirms the *holding* of it to be an *Arch-Heresy*, and the propagating of that Doctrine to be a *grievous Sin*. (And sure I am the Doctors of the *Sorbonne* were formerly of the same Mind with Mr. *White*, and I believe are so still.) And I my self have met with some Papists, who have plainly *derided* the Doctrine of the *personal Infallibility of the Pope*, and not without great Indignation disowned it to be an Article of their Faith. As for the latter Point, concerning

---

† *Tabula Suffrag. cap. 19, 20, 21. Vide & Holdenii Divina Fidei Analyfim, pag. 179.*

cerning the Superiority of the Pope to a General Council, all those who disown the former, must reject this also. For the Pope cannot be imagined superior to a General Council upon any other Account than this, that he is guided (at least when he sits in his enchanted Chair) by an infallible Spirit, to judge of the Determinations of General Councils, whether they are true or false, and accordingly to *confirm* or *reject* them. Yet this Point must be held by all that own the \* Council of *Florence*, or the Confession of Faith according to the Council of *Trent*; for in both of them it is determined,

---

\* *Vide Caranz. Sum. Concil. Florent. & Synod. Ann. 1439, pag. 655, 676.*

ned, that the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, is the Pastor, Governor, and Head of the Universal Church, which cannot be true, if the Pope be subject to the Universal Church, represented by her Bishops in a General Council. Hence \* Gregory of Valence, a learned Papist, speaking of those that held a General Council to be superior to the Pope, saith, *that they did indeed plainly thwart (though unawares) the most certain Faith concerning St. Peter and the Bishop of Rome's Primacy in the Church.* Indeed, they that

---

\* *Atque binc profecto illorum Auctorum Sententia manifeste revincitur, qui Concilium Universale Pontifice superius faciunt. Pugnant enim illi revera (licet non advertentes) cum certissima fide de D. Petri ac Romani Pontificis in Ecclesia primatu. Gregor. de Valent. cont. Theolog. Tom. III. Disp. 1. Qu. 1. Punct. 7.*

do, seem to forget their very Name of *Papists*, which was given them from their Dependance on the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, the Head of the Church, and the infallible Judge of all Controversies. This then must be held as an undoubted Article of Faith, and the very Foundation of the *Roman Catholick Religion*, *That the Pope is superior to a General Council*. Now from this great Article of Faith, not only Mr. *White*, and the Persons but now mentioned, but also divers other *Roman Catholicks* of a higher Rank, have egregiously prevaricated. We have a numerous Assembly of many hundreds of Bishops, called together



together by the Emperor Sigismund  
at \* Constance, determining point  
blank against this great Article: For  
in the 4th Session they define, That  
the Synod, lawfully gathered together  
in the Holy Ghost, and making a Ge-  
neral Council, and representing the  
Catholick Church Militant, hath a  
Power immediately from Christ, to  
which every Man, of whatsoever  
State or Dignity, though it be the  
Pope himself, is bound to yield Obedi-  
ence, &c. And presently after they  
decree, That if any Man, though he  
were the Pope himself, should refuse  
to obey the Decrees of this Synod, or  
any

---

\* Caranz. Summ. Concil. Constant. Sess. 4. 5.  
pag. 647, 648.

any other General Council lawfully gathered together, he should do Penance and suffer condign Punishment. And about sixteen Years after the Council of \* Basl (in the 2d Session) decreed the same Thing in the very same Words. Nay, in the third Session, they determined this to be a Catholick Verity, and that whosoever should oppose it, should be accounted an Heretick. 'Tis to no Purpose here to answer (as Bellarmine and others have done) that these Councils were no lawful Councils, as not confirmed by the Pope. For supposing this to be true, (which certainly is most false, and it may  


---

be

\* Caranz. Summ. Concil. Basl. p. 665, 672.

be easily evinced that each of those Councils was confirmed by a Pope) yet still it is confessed, both that these Bishops (which were well nigh all the Bishops of the Western Churches) were of the *Roman Catholic Religion and Communion*, and that they did so determine as we have said. Let me now ask the Author of the *Letter* this Question, *Was the Superiority of the Pope to a General Council* an Article of Faith in the Time of the Council of *Constance* and *Basil*, or not? If it was, then here we have the *Roman Catholic Bishops* generally guilty of Prevarication from an Article of Faith, and that the main Article of

the *Roman* Catholick Religion. And then what is become of that uninterrupted Succession of Pastors (which the Author of the *Letter* so much boasts of) in the *Roman* Church, always holding the same Articles of Religion? If it was not then held for an Article of Faith, as it is manifest enough it was not, from the Testimony of so many Bishops, then are they guilty of a grievous Prevarication, who have since made that an Article of Faith which was not so before, but rather was held to be an Error, yea, a downright Heresy. So that on the one side or the other, here must of Necessity be acknowledged a ve-



ry lamentable Prevarication from a great fundamental Article of the Roman Faith.

§. 32. But let us come more closely to that *Standard* of the Roman Faith, which I am assured the Author of the *Letter* acknowledgeth for such, viz. *The Decrees of the Council of Trent*. It is well known that a great Number of those that call themselves *Roman Catholics*, are so far from being concluded by the Decrees of that Council, that they utterly reject the Authority thereof, accounting it as an unlawful and irregular Convention. And yet the Author of the *Letter* dares not (I am sure) pronounce all these

these to be Heretical; and as for those that profess to submit themselves to the Authority of that Council, how egregiously have many of them prevaricated from the Canons and Decrees thereof?

If the *Gentleman* hath been so little conversant in the Authors of his own Church as to deny this, I will undertake to prove it by the clearest Evidences, even by the Confession of Papists themselves. But that which I chiefly insist on, (to shew the Prevarication of the *Trent* Papists) is this, That no Man can make Profession of his Faith, according to the Council of *Trent*, without being guilty, in that very

Pro-

Profession of Prevarication, in the highest Degree, even to *Perjury*. For your Ladyship may please to understand, that the *Confession of Faith*, according to the Council of *Trent*, is made with a solemn Oath: Now in this *Confession*, I. They swear \* *to receive as undoubted all Things delivered, defined, and declared by the Canons and General Councils, and especially by the holy Council of Trent.* Now, any understanding Man, that impartially reads the Canons and the Decrees of those Councils, acknowledged for General by the Papists, will find it impossible to reconcile

---

\* *Omnia a Sacris Canonibus & Oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a Sacrosanctâ Synodo Tridentinâ tradita, definita, ac declarata, indubitanter recipio ac profiteor.*

them one to another. II. They swear with the same Breath where- with they profess their Reception of all the Canons and General Coun- cils, that † *they acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church of Rome to be the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, and the Pope to be Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to be also the Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom our Obedience is due.*

Now it is very manifest, that the first and most famous General Coun- cil of Nice, in the 6th Canon de-

---

† *Sanctam Catholicam & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magi- stram agnosco: Romanog; Pontifici B. S. Petri A- postolorum Principis Successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.*



erees, That every *Patriarch*, within his Province, hath full and perfect Jurisdiction, without any Dependance upon the Church or Bishop of *Rome*, or any other Church or Bishop; and that the Jurisdiction of the Church and Bishop of *Rome* is no less limited than that of other Churches and Patriarchs. Let any Man compare the \* Words of the Canon with the usual Answers given by the Papist, and (if he does not wink very hard) he must needs see what wretched Shifts a bad Cause

H h

will

---

\* Τα ἀρχαῖα ἐν καλεῖτο τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὡς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν καὶ ἐκκοιῖαν ἐκδοῦν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ Ἐπίσκοπον πῦτο στανθὺς ἐστίν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ ἐκκλησίαις. *Jussell. Codex Cant. Ecclesiae Univers. pag. 30, 31.*

will put Men to. Other Instances I might give your Ladyship of the apparent Contradictions of that Confession; but these are sufficient to shew, that every Man who swears to the Confession of *Trent*, must necessarily be a perjured Person, either knowingly <sup>and</sup> ~~or~~ wittingly, or ignorantly and unadvisedly, and the best of these two Sorts of Perjury is bad enough. And now I leave it to your Ladyship to judge who are the Prevaricators.

§. 33. Thus I have largely examined every Thing in the Letter, that seemed to me any Way worthy of Answer. What follows in the Close, is nothing else but a Bundle  
of

of specious Words, which I know your Ladyship to be too wise to be deceived by. Only I cannot but take Notice how *Enthusiastical* and perfectly Fanatical his Discourse is concerning Faith and Conversion. He tells your Ladyship very gravely, that true Faith is the immediate Gift of God. But a graver Apostle assures us, that *Faith comes by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God*, that is, That a Man must first have the Object of his Faith clearly and convincingly propounded to him, and that as declared by the *Word of God or Divine Revelation*, before he can truly believe, or be obliged so to do. He encourageth your La-

dyship to expect a Conversion no  
 less miraculous than that of *St.*  
*Paul*, and promiseth the Contribu-  
 tion of his Prayers for the obtaining  
 of so great a Favour. It seems he  
 supposeth your Ladyship to be at  
 present in a sad Estate, like that of  
*St. Paul* when he was yet a *Saul*, in  
 a State of Infidelity persecuting the  
 Church of God. But your Adhæ-  
 sion to the Church of *England*,  
 (wherein, as I have largely proved,  
 the Rule of Faith and all the fun-  
 damental Articles of the Christian  
 Religion are received, taught, pro-  
 fessed, and acknowledged) secures  
 you from *Infidelity* and *Heresy*; and  
 your known and exemplary Piety  
 gives



gives me Ground to believe, that you are in the Number of those *righteous* Persons (of whom our Saviour speaks, *Luke 15. v. 7.*) that *need no Repentance*, that is, no *universal Change* from a State of Sin and Death to a State of Grace and Salvation. But if your Ladyship's present Estate were as bad as your kind Relation represents it, yet he gives you no just Ground to expect so miraculous a Conversion as that of *St. Paul's*; and I doubt all his Prayers to *Saints* and *Angels* would prove ineffectual for that Purpose. But would your Ladyship understand the plain *English* of this Fanatick Discourse? For all his Pretences

tences to the contrary, he is unwilling that your Ladyship should consult your serious Reason: For then he despairs (and not without Reason) that ever you will come off to the Church of *Rome*; but he would have you to wait for some *violent, sudden, and unaccountable Impulse*, that should drive your Ladyship (you know not *why* or *wherefore*) into the Bosom of their Church, where he promises ~~both~~ a *delightful and sweet Repose*. How *sweet* it will be I know not, but sure I am it will not be very *safe*. Let me therefore humbly beseech your Ladyship to stick to his first Advice, to consult your serious Reason, and

and (let me add) those learned *Divines* of our Church that are near you, who are abundantly able to rescue your Ladyship from the little trifling Arrests of the *Roman* Emis-  
saries; and especially to consult the undoubted Oracles of God, the Holy Scriptures, which the Author of the *Letter* himself tells you, *should be our Guidance unto true Faith and Perfection*; and to all to add your daily Prayers to Almighty God, that he would lead you into and confirm you in his holy Truth, and deliver you from the Snares of Error, which are with so close and cunning a Contrivance every where laid among us: And then I doubt  
not

not but you will continue stedfast in  
the Communion of that Church,  
wherein at present by the gracious  
Providence of God you live, and  
bless God that you are there.

If my weak Endeavours may be  
farther serviceable to your Lady-  
ship in this great Affair, be pleased  
freely to command,

MADAM,

*Your Ladyship's most truly*

*devoted Servant in all*

*Christian Offices,*

Suddington in  
Gloucester-  
shire, Octo-  
ber, 18, 1671

George Bull.



